The Comedy of English Protestantism

Private Library

REV. D. R. MACDONALD.

Glen Nevis

No. 149

Glengarry Co

Ont.

283
M355

THE

Comedy of English Protestantism.

IN THREE ACTS.

SCENE: EXETER HALL, LONDON.

TIME: THE SUMMER OF 1893.

EDITED BY

A. F. MARSHALL, B.A. OXON.

"For how can she constrain them to obey,
Who has herself cast off the lawful sway?"

—DRYDEN'S "*The Hind and the Panther.*"

REV. JAMES A. GRANT BEQUEST TO
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY, 1926

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO:

BENZIGER BROTHERS.

1894.

Copyright, 1893, by Benziger Brothers.

12206

It was the brilliant suggestion of a well-known Broad Churchman: "Let us assemble a Grand Council in Exeter Hall, London, with a view to restoring all the sects in Great Britain to the embrace of their mother, the Church of England." The first idea was that each of the sects should send its delegate, and that each delegate should take for his watchword, "Reunion." Yet there was one grave inconvenience in the way of such a council—that there were more than two hundred sects in Great Britain; and it was felt that if two hundred delegates were to be all talking together in Exeter Hall, each one expatiating on his own theology, there would need to be a commanding personage in the chief chair of the assembly, to preserve the harmony and the amenity of disputation. This difficulty was, however, astutely got over by limiting the number of delegates to seven; these seven to

act as delegates for the entire kingdom—their representative value to be as follows:

1. The *Rev. Sebastian Stole* was chosen delegate for the Ritualists.
2. To *Canon Courtly* were confided the interests of the Low Church party.
3. *Dr. Wylde* was the approved counsel for the Latitudinarians, better known perhaps in these days as Broad Churchmen.
4. The Wesleyans selected the *Rev. Walter Sterling* as the representative of the various Methodist communities.
5. *Captain Banner* was the appointed orator for the Salvation Army.
6. The Home-Made Sects had an eloquent advocate in *Mr. Moore*, the well-known author of "Variety in Doctrine, the Surest Evidence of Real Unity in Belief."
7. The Imported Sects secured the championship of *Pastor Dort*, the efficient minister of the Arminian Chapel, Land's End.

On the morning of one of the most beautiful days in May all these delegates were on the platform of Exeter Hall; and it is needless to record—all England must have heard of it—that the hall was densely crowded in every part; many clergymen being unable to find chairs, and one venerable archdeacon being seen to contend with a Salvationist as to the prior claim to a front seat in the gallery. Within a very few minutes, however, it became obvious that the vast concourse was not composed of grave, deliberative theologians; a large number of persons having made their way into the hall who were not particularly attached to any religion, and who would be not unlikely to disturb the harmony of the Council by observations which would be more spontaneous than reverent. Yet this admixture was a natural accident of a great meeting.

As the clock struck ten, the President, Professor Chaos, moved slowly and with dignity into an arm-chair which was placed just in front of the organ; and, silence being commanded, the huge audience calmed down, with mingled cheerfulness, apprehension, and even awe.

The President (addressing the audience with much solemnity). You will agree with me that it is a sublime object for which we are met here to-day. Unhappily divided as we are in this country, by reason of the glorious freedom of the Protestant faith—through the very Scripturalness, I may say, of that liberty of private judgment which was won for us by the Reformers in the sixteenth century—we are, nevertheless, all one in our belief in Christ, and in our belief——

(A voice from the gallery: "That every one, except yourself, is wrong.")

The President. I must really beg that there may be no unseemly interruptions. Legitimate comment is one thing, but mere frivolity

is out of place on this grave occasion. ("Hear, hear," from a few of the audience.) I was saying, when I was interrupted, that we are all united in our belief in Christ; and I was about to add that our differences are in the main unimportant; or, if important, they are only rendered so by the perfectly natural tenacity with which each person clings to his own opinions.

This question of the important and the unimportant is, I am aware, beset with some difficulty. It is objected: How can we *know* what is important or unimportant, when we have only our own private opinion to guide us—our own interpretation of the Scriptures to enlighten us? I consider this objection to be specious. There is but one sovereignly important article of the Christian faith, and that is Redemption through Christ; while, in regard to the nature of the Sacraments, of Church Authority, of the Christian Priesthood, or indeed of any of the so-called dogmas of the Catholic Creeds, there must be the widest possible margin for personal proclivity, for private disposition or aspiration. Our differences, I

am persuaded, are on the surface; our agreement is deep down in the wells of truth. I see around me representatives of two hundred sects; and I cannot doubt that if they would all throw their opinions together, and melt them down in a common crucible in this historic hall, they would find the result to be a very substantial *credo*, with only a limited amount of *nego*, or perhaps *cogito?* (Shouts of "No, no.") Well, it may be I am giving credit for too much magnanimity (A voice: "You mean, too little conscience") to many respected adherents to their own opinions; what I meant to say was that many people think they are devoted to Divine truth, whereas they are really only devoted to their own prejudice. (Cries of "Oh, oh.")

Now *why* are there more than two hundred sects? Can it be supposed that there are more than two hundred Gods? (Loud laughter.) Or can it be supposed that one God can approve of two hundred divisions in that family which was created by the one Christ? We all know that schism is wrong; we are all agreed that we ought to be

united in one body; we are all aware that, even in the big Church of England — where there is more schism, more division, more sectarianism, than in all the sects outside it put together — there is a constant lamentation over doctrinal discord, with the constant prayer that the ceaseless strife may be put an end to; yet, though we know these things, here we are in the year 1893, many centuries after the time of the Reformation (A voice: "The sole cause of it all"), without the smallest ray of hope that our schisms will be ended, and that Christian unity will be once more restored to us.

My friends, we are here to-day to find a solution. Seven delegates, representing more than two hundred sects, will address you upon the grave duty of Christian unity. (Suppressed laughter.) I will call first upon the Rev. Canon Courtly, to speak for the painfully divided Church of England; or rather for that section of it which is known as the Low Church party, in contrast with the Broad Church party, and the Ritualistic.

The Low Church Delegate. I feel the grav-

ity of the responsibility you have laid upon me. I recognize that the chief cause of Dissent in this country has been the shortcomings of our national Established Church. ("Hear, hear.") I speak with diffidence, yet I cannot divest myself of the conviction that the Church of England has been the mother of all the sects. Perhaps she could not avoid this sad maternity. When the Church of England broke with the Catholic Church—(The Ritualist Delegate: "Pardon me, sir, with the Roman Church, not with the Catholic Church")—When the Church of England broke with the Catholic Roman Church, she broke with the whole principle of Church Authority. The consequence was that every man became a Church unto himself. And though, for my part, I am an ardent advocate of private judgment, I do not confuse two principles which are as opposite as the poles, the obeying another's authority, and the obeying my own. Now it is obvious that the Church of England, having repudiated Church Authority, and having set up in its stead the individual interpretation of every text of both the Testaments, New and Old, cannot

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OAKLAND, CAL.

consistently blame Dissenters for carrying onward to their logical ultimate the primary principles of Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth. It seems to me to have been simply absurd for Protestant churchmen in the Tudor times to say—as they quickly began to say—to all Dissenters: *We* will separate just so far as we like from Rome, but we will not allow *you* to separate one inch from ourselves. *We* will approve the doctrine that the licentious King, Henry VIII., could create himself sole pontiff of the Church in England; but we will not allow *you* to transfer your spiritual homage to teachers who are at least as spiritual as was this monster—to men who have not butchered nor turned adrift numerous wives, nor beheaded their trusty and true friends. *We* will allow Queen Elizabeth to create for herself and for us a perfectly brand-new ecclesiastical jurisdiction—(The Ritualist Delegate: "No, no, the ancient jurisdiction of this realm.") Pardon me, sir, the jurisdiction of a Prime Minister—of Lord Palmerston, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone—was *not* the ancient, ecclesiastical jurisdiction of this realm. I was say-

ing—but I do not blame the Ritualist Delegate for the interruption, though it slightly mars the harmony of my illustration—Queen Elizabeth was not consistent in declaring to Non-Conformists, "*I* will appropriate to myself the exclusive, pontifical rights of all orthodoxy; and by the most awful infliction of penal laws, through forty years, I will compel my subjects to adopt my religion, or to be fined, sent to prison, and finally hanged; but I will not allow *you* to think for one moment for yourselves, or to be disobedient to Queen, Parliament, or jailers." Now I, for my part, am attached to the Church of England. (Much laughter.) I do not say to the origin of the Church of England, but to the existing institution, as we enjoy it. I regard that Church as a reasonable compromise between the austere rule of Rome and the ecclesiastical anarchy of sectarianism. The origin of the Church of England may have been detestable, but its present development is an all-wide catholicity, admirably adapted to the independent character of Englishmen, and so elastic as to admit of the widest possible divergence between

bishops, priests, deacons, and the whole of the laity. This is what I think a church ought to be. I have nothing to do now—such things happened three centuries ago—with the secular causes which parented the Reformation; with the divorce of Henry VIII. from Catherine of Arragon—which was the sole reason why the king broke with the Church of Rome; nor with the illegitimacy of Henry's daughter, the Princess Elizabeth—which illegitimacy was the sole reason of her Protestantism. As to the Whys and Hows of the Reformation, I have no need to trouble myself; they only concerned the originators, and may be forgotten. What I have to do with is the present character of the Church of England; and I say that I approve that character, because it makes everything a matter of private opinion; and *I* am the inflexible advocate of private opinion. I want to insist upon this point before I urge on you, my dissenting brethren, the extreme facility, if not the duty, of becoming Anglicans. If I were asked to describe Anglican theology, as to its spirit, its intention, its embrace, I should say: It is "the ecclesiastical consecra-

tion of private judgment." (Laughter, and cries of "No, no," and tokens of strong dissent from the Ritualist Delegate.) Well, my friends, what is *not* a matter of opinion? If you will answer me that question I will give in to you. The Thirty-nine Articles are only matters of opinion; especially those articles which assert that the "Church *hath* authority" yet that anybody may teach the Church what it ought to teach. Everything in the Church of England is a matter of opinion; the very Bible itself being the Uninterpreted Law, of which every man is to be himself the sole interpreter. But why insist upon what everybody knows? Take the last three big movements of the three big parties in the Church, and tell me if I am not justified in my assertion. The Ritualists have recently started a perfectly new Anglican Church, which is supposed to teach the exact opposite, in doctrine, ritual, and devotion, of what all good Protestants have believed to be "Anglican" for three centuries. The Broad Church party have recently taken within their embrace both scientific scepticism and agnosticism. The Low

Church party—with which I myself am most in sympathy—have gone out toward Dissent with a friendly warmth, and have proposed the interchange of pulpits with Non-Conformists. Thus all parties are united in that one conspicuously Anglican dogma, that every man may believe what he likes, and yet remain a faithful member of the Church of England. Ritualism, and the most comprehensive Broad Churchism; transcendental Protestant Popery, and the most abysmal Puritanism—all, all are included in the same communion, all, all are simply matters of opinion. And lest any of you should call me to account—and I see that my esteemed friend, the Ritualist Delegate, is preparing whips and scorpions for my back—I will take shelter under the wing of the highest authority in the Church of England—no less a personage than Archbishop Benson. I am sure that if I can convince you that the archbishop and myself take exactly the same view as to private judgment; that, if anything, his Grace is even more elastic than I am—a warmer champion for the rights of liberty of conscience—I shall have persuaded you that

you may, every one of you, come inside the Establishment, and yet continue to hold fast to your present opinions.

(Marks of interest and attention among the audience, and of evident anxiety on the part of the President and of the Ritualist Delegate.)

Now I say that I may take the Archbishop of Canterbury for my authority that the Church of England teaches nothing, denies nothing, save what every one believes, no one denies. Who that read his Grace's Pastoral to the Anglican clergy, on the subject of Variety in Christian Worship, could fail to be edified by his sublimely charitable counsel as to the duty of the Anglican clergy toward the laity? I own that when I read that Pastoral I was at once struck by its comprehensiveness—I was going to say by its equatorial girth—and set wondering—though not for the first time in my experience—why there should *need* to be an Archbishop of Canterbury. You all remember that the Bishop of Lincoln's ultra-Ritualism was the occasion of this archiepiscopal pronouncement; and you may also remember the generous terms of the supreme ruling, in

which the Archbishop couched his command, "Pray, please everybody." I must quote to you a few words from the Pastoral, so as to demonstrate its perfect Christian politeness, or what I may call its spiritual good breeding. After reminding the clergy that "there was no church in the world in which parish priests or ministers had anything like the same independence, in or out of Church, as the parochial clergy had"—an independence of which I am sure we must all gratefully acknowledge that the clergy have most liberally availed themselves—his Grace of Canterbury told his clergy "not to make any changes in their conduct of Divine service, unless they were first assured of the unanimity of their people in desiring such change;" that even if they had, ordinarily, such Ritualistic services as implied a belief in the Catholic doctrine of Holy Mass, still, they must sometimes, "especially on the first Sunday of the month," have a Low Church form of service, "which should meet in all ways the desire of their parishioners" who happened to look on Holy Mass as an abomination; and that "the true pastor would delight to be one

with his people," in adopting such a character of public worship as should reflect their immediate views on Christian doctrine. Thus Real Presence and No Presence, Priesthood and No Priesthood, Divine Faith and purely natural opinionism ought to be held to be of equal value, equal truth; so that on no account should the "true pastor" presume to teach anybody anything; *his* duty being to be taught authoritatively by his congregation. (Cries of "Question," and merriment.)

Now as I was pondering what would be the effect of this Pastoral on the Ritualists, I received a letter from a valued friend who is a Ritualist—a Ritualist of a very advanced type—and who holds a cure in one of the South London parishes. If you will permit me I will read to you that letter; for, though it conveys in sarcastic language a Ritualist's contempt for the supreme authority, it happily proves that Dr. Anybody, or Dr. Everybody, might claim a warm doctrinal sympathy from our good archbishop. (Cries of "Oh, oh," and "Shame.") Our object here to-day being to remove all disabilities which mar the harmony

REV. JAMES A. GRANT BEQUEST TO
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY, 1929

of all sects with the Church of England, everything which goes to prove that there is no real difference between any of us must clear the way to a happy mutual understanding. Let it be shown then that the Archbishop of Canterbury approves all the varieties of religious doctrine within that Church over which he worthily presides, and we shall have removed the principal hindrance to our combination—a combination of happy indifference to details.

My Ritualist friend's letter—written the very day after the publication of the Pastoral to which I am calling your attention—(and here Canon Courtly drew the letter from his pocket) was couched in the following playful vein:

My Dear Canon:

I wondered, after reading the Archbishop's Pastoral, what you, as a good Protestant, would think of it. I have a mind to throw the Pastoral into popular form, and publish it for the moderate price of one penny, so that all England may apprehend its graceful clemency.

The Pastoral, without unfairness or exaggeration, might be rendered in such language as the following:

"You are aware, my reverend brethren, that I am set over you by Her Majesty—from whom alone I receive authority and jurisdiction—expressly to conform my teaching to your wishes, and to make things as comfortable as I can. The Church of England is an institution which was designed by Queen Elizabeth for the happy combination of all opposites—for the generous comprehension of all heresies—and it is my proud lot to encourage you in expanding a latitudinarianism which shall exclude no one who is called Christian from your communion. Therefore, let those who believe in the adorable sacrifice of the Mass, and those who call that belief gross idolatry, be equally dear to you, equally treasured as true believers. At the same time, do not *mix* your different creeds. Keep them distinct for the sake of appearances and of peace. If the majority of your parishioners are Ritualists, say Mass for them three Sundays out of four; and on the fourth Sunday teach them that Mass is a superstition, so as to quiet the sensitive conscience of Low Church people. On the other hand, if the majority of your congregation are Low

Church people, have a Low Church service three Sundays out of four; and on the fourth Sunday light your candles on the altar, wave your incense, bend your knee, 'mix the chalice,' so as to imply that on *that* Sunday you are a Roman Catholic. You will find this an agreeable change and recreation. You will be relieved from a dull sameness or uniformity. Happy are the people, blessed are the congregation, who have a pastor so wise and so large-hearted, that he can change his belief quite as frequently as his white cravat, and can perform feats in spiritual acrobatism which, compared with the circus-memories of our childhood, suggest an agility and a mobility which are preternatural."

(Some expressions of amusement, mixed with groans of deprecation.)

Now this letter, though sarcastic, at least justifies my view that the Archbishop of Canterbury, the highest authority for all Anglicans, does not recognize any difficulty in the way of Reunion. His Grace is above all things a gentleman; and a gentleman is one who considers other people's feelings, and is ready

to sacrifice his own views to kindly amenity. If, then, the archbishop sees no difference between doctrines—and we all know that ritual is the honest expression of doctrine, and that the two cannot by possibility be divorced—it follows that the Church of England sees no difference between doctrines, though, for appearance' sake, she seeks to formulate certain opinions. Why, then, should we be any longer disunited? Can we not agree to assimilate each other's doctrines? Can we not—to carry out the views of the Archbishop—exchange convictions, exchange services, exchange ritual, exchange doctrines, exchange everything for which we have a personal predilection, and so exhibit to the world the sublime spectacle of sectarian harmony, based on the extremest limits of Christian charity, and graced by the highest breeding of good manners? For my part, my pulpit is open to every one who can turn sinners from an evil life to repentance, and who cares more for brotherly love than for dogma or church services, for candles, colored stoles, or genuflexions.

(The canon resumed his seat amid plaudits

and hisses; the major part of the audience appearing to be not quite convinced that he had found the "solution" which Professor Chaos had hoped for. The delegate for the Broad Church party was just rising to respond, when the President, interrupting, said:)

The President (addressing the Low Church Delegate). I think, sir, you have been unjust in your satire in regard to the doctrinal width of the Archbishop. In the recent judgment, in the case of the Bishop of Lincoln, the Archbishop most emphatically laid it down that there were certain things which a bishop must *not* do. I presume you had forgotten that fact?

The Low Church Delegate. No, sir, I had not forgotten it; but I was unwilling to allude to so delicate a subject as the impeachment of a living Anglican bishop. I will, however, as you wish it, add a word.

The sum of the Archbishop's judgment amounted to this: You, my Lord Bishop of Lincoln, have done some shocking things when ministering at the Holy Table. You have lit candles, and that too in broad daylight. You

have mixed water with wine for Holy Communion. You have made use of an ablution, like a Catholic priest. You have stood with your back to the people, at the time when you were supposed to be consecrating. You have caused the "Agnus Dei" to be sung, in imitation of the singing of it in Catholic churches. And, finally—which is the most painful offence of all—you have actually made the sign of the cross when giving absolution and benediction.

Now, I do not wish, my Lord Bishop, to be too severe upon your novelties, or to curb your natural taste for Protestant Popery. I want to find excuses for you, if it be possible. I therefore say to you: There was nothing positively criminal in lighting candles—provided they were not lit "ceremoniously." Water might be mixed with the sacramental wine—provided no one *saw* you commit the offence. An ablution might be legitimately used—on the same condition of privacy and unobservedness. The "Agnus Dei" might be harmlessly sung—for the simple reason that it is not rubrically forbidden. But there are two offences which must not on any account be repeated.

You must not make the sign of the cross; and you must not turn your back on the people.

Now the President has observed to me that these two important reservations proved that the Primate "drew the line" at downright Popery. I agree with him. The Primate says: "You must not make the sign of the cross, because that would mean that you were a real Catholic bishop; and you must not turn your back on the people, because that would mean that you were saying the Catholic Mass; and the Church of England only permits Popery in *theory*, she does not sanction it in practice, in affirmation." Now I think that——

(At this point, however, the Ritualist Delegate, the Rev. Sebastian Stole, rose in an excited way from his chair, and ejaculated the startling observation, "There can be no question that the Archbishop of Canterbury ought to resign." So soon as the disturbance which followed this outburst had become sufficiently calmed or exhausted, the Low Church Delegate inquired of Mr. Stole, "How would you justify that unique admonition?")

The Ritualist Delegate. Nothing could be more easy. Let me take only the ruling as to not making the sign of the cross; and I say that on this ruling alone the Archbishop is bound to resign. I will prove it in this way. Every Ritualist is aware that it was the custom of the early Christians to make the sign of the cross on all occasions; not only when performing priestly acts, but when engaging in the simplest duties of domestic life. Tertullian, who wrote in the second century, recorded this historic fact in the following words: "The early Christians, in all their travels and movements, in all their comings-in and goings-out, in putting on their shoes, in the bath, at the table, in lighting their candles, in lying down, in sitting down, whatever occupation engaged them, were wont to mark their foreheads with the sign of the cross." Now since the Archbishop has laid it down, "You must *not* make the sign of the cross," while it is absolutely certain that the primitive Christians always did so, it follows that the Archbishop is not a primitive Christian, and is not therefore a true Anglo-Catholic.

The Low Church Delegate. But on the same principle ought not the Bishop of Lincoln to resign? If the Archbishop of Canterbury ought to resign because he is *not* a primitive Christian, ought not the Bishop of Lincoln to resign because he is not *allowed* to be primitive? To be a primitive Christian in a Church which is not primitive is certainly as unreasonable as to affirm of the same Church that it is both primitive and condemns primitive practices.

The President. As to the duty of resigning, I really think, if you will excuse me, that you are pushing consistency too far. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Lincoln probably both think that it would be as reasonable to ask the Privy Council to resign, or indeed to ask the whole Church of England to set a noble example of resignation. If every one were to resign in the Anglican Establishment, on the ground that he had a theology of his own, that institution would not have a single member left. I remember, forty years ago, when the Privy Council delivered judgment on the question of Baptismal Regeneration, deciding that an Anglican might believe

it or might deny it according to his individual proclivity, it was expected that there would be a vast resignation of curacies, rectories, vicarages, archdeacons, deaneries, and even bishoprics. A few clergymen became Catholics, and were much abused for it. But the rest suddenly discovered that the Privy Council had no authority, any more than had the Archbishop of Canterbury, or even the two houses of Convocation, or even—if it might be said with due reverence—Queen Victoria. A threat to resign a cure of souls, in Anglican sense, means only, "You *deserve* that I should resign; but if I were to withdraw my personal orthodoxy from your Communion, where would you be without me, miserable heretics?" (Great laughter.)

(The Low Church Delegate having once more sat down, and the subject of "resignation" being closed, the Broad Church Delegate quickly rose. The audience were evidently a little anxious about his "views," after the extremely lax theology of Canon Courtly.)

The Broad Church Delegate. I had listened with deep interest to the Low Church Delegate;

and, in the main, I was disposed to agree with him. There was only one point on which I utterly differed from him, though this point was rather practical than doctrinal. *He* earnestly invited you to come *inside* the Church of England. *I* as earnestly invite you to stay *outside*—if indeed there be an inside or an outside to the Church of England. (Some disturbance; many persons shouting, "Do you call *this* Reunion?" or "What are you *there* for? this is trifling." The tumult having subsided, the Broad Church Delegate proceeded:) I have no doubt that in the course of a few minutes I shall have succeeded in making you perfectly understand how I reconcile these sentiments with Reunion. Bear with me till I have completed my argument.

Now I am supposed to represent *only* the Broad Church party; yet I maintain that most of the clergy of the Establishment—every one of the Ritualists included—are quite as broad in their sympathies as I am myself. If they are not, how can they remain in communion with crowds of clergy who differ from them upon many points of doctrine; differ as widely

as does affirmation from repudiation, as the most conscientious insistence from mocking scorn? The Low Church Delegate has just proved to you that the Archbishop of Canterbury sits loosely to any dogmatic belief whatever; only drawing the line where too positive an affirmation might offend the susceptibilities of good Protestants. And now I shall make it my business to show to you that many Anglican bishops, deans, dignitaries are equally comprehensive in their theologies. You remember that at a recent Church Congress, which was held in the course of last summer at Grindelwald, there was one day's discussion which was presided over by an Anglican prelate, Dr. Perowne, the esteemed Bishop of Worcester. Now I must mention that at this Congress were present clergymen of every school: High, Dry, Anglican, and Ritualistic, besides Low, Slow, Evangelical, and Associationist—eight divisions which are classified by a Quarterly Reviewer; and therefore it was just the assembly to do justice to my contention, that there is no inside and no outside to the Church of England. When I say to you

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE OAKLAND - CAL.

that I warmly urge on you the counsel to "stay outside the absolutely boundless Church of England," I know that you will reply to me: "You love a paradox; for that which is boundless can have no outside." But then the paradox is the very gist of the truism. Wherever you are, my dissenting brethren, you cannot be, doctrinally, *outside* the Church of England; and consequently, not being outside, how can you come in?

Now, first, take the words of the President of the Church Congress—Dr. Perowne, the Bishop of Worcester—in regard to Episcopacy, or rather on the Apostolical Succession. He says that, as to the contention that a "ministry, to be valid, must be able to trace its descent from the Apostles," it is "a monstrous doctrine," . . . "something too fearful to contemplate." Well, I perfectly agree with him, but that is not the point to be considered. The Bishop argues that "the Apostolical Succession is one thing, but that an historic episcopate is another thing;" which our Ritualist friends will say is like arguing that "an unbroken chain is one thing, but a chain with

its links broken is another thing." The Bishop, however, insists that the Church of England "nowhere in her articles or her Formularies asserts that episcopacy is necessary to the existence of a Church or to the validity of her sacraments. . . . The Church of England *prefers* episcopacy, but she does not condemn Presbyterianism. . . . Non-Conformist ministers may be accepted as properly ordained. . . . It is however hopeless"—and here follows a remark which may perhaps puzzle the ordinary stickler for consistency—"to look for Reunion of the Church of England with the Non-Conformist Churches except on the condition that their ministers shall submit to ordination by a Church of England bishop. And this, I fear, makes all hope of Reunion for the present impossible."

To show, however, how thoroughly the Bishop of Worcester and myself are in accord as to there being no outside and no inside to the national Church, I will add that his Lordship administered Holy Communion to Non-Conformists according to the ritual of his own Church. "Never shall I forget," wrote the

Bishop of Worcester to the *Times*, "the solemn communion of last Sunday, when, in the Zwinglian church of Grindelwald, I, assisted by three clergymen of the English and Irish Churches, administered the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the form prescribed in the Prayer-Book, to leading ministers and other representatives of the Scotch Presbyterian and English Non-Conformist Churches." (Here the Ritualist Delegate audibly whispered, "Disgraceful!")

Thus far, then, as to Dissent *versus* Episcopacy. And now a word as to the doctrine of Baptism. I think that the Episcopal teaching on this subject was very luminous. Certain Baptists had affirmed—so said the Bishop—that they "would consent to no Reunion which should express connivance with the soul-destroying error on the subject of Baptism;" and this, at first sound, was rather alarming. The Bishop, however, quickly assured the Baptists that there was really no reason to be uneasy, since "what was called the soul-destroying error was repudiated by probably *half* of the members of the Church of England itself."

Half of the members! So that here we have the entire Establishment split up into two warring camps on the primary doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. But now I want you to scan critically the Bishop's pleading. "Are Non-Conformists justified," asked his Lordship, "in putting *only* that interpretation upon the Formularies and Articles of the Church of England which is put upon them by the extreme High Church party? Will it not be quite possible for them to unite with the Church of England, and yet to maintain *all* those views on sacramental grace which they now maintain, and which are held or maintained by a large section of English churchmen?" Well, really I think you will agree with me: if so-called Anglicans may put various interpretations on the same formularies of the same Church in the same country, it would be very hard upon Non-Conformists if they might not put their own interpretations upon formularies which can have no significance whatever. ("Hear, hear," from the Dissenting party.)

In short, the Bishop of Worcester evidently

agreed with Mr. R. F. Horton, M.A., who said, at the same Congress, that he did "not wish any section of the Christian Church abolished, because there was just as much necessity for each of them as for the Church of England itself." He would agree also with the Rev. J. H. Battersby, who said that "Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists should combine with Episcopalians in conserving all that was best in each." So too probably he would agree with the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes that, as "Anglicans number only twenty millions, and Non-Conformists number sixty millions"—of course he was speaking of the entire world—"conversion to any one Church in particular might be regarded as mathematically impossible." And, finally, he would agree with the statement of Père Hyacinthe, the well-known New Protestant or Old Catholic, "*La réforme du 16^e^ siècle a sauvé l'Église en la divisant;*" though whether he would agree with him in the prophecy, "*la réforme du 20^e^ la sauvera en l'unisant,*" must be left to the individual speculation.

But I have wearied you with this Church

Congress chatter. I only wanted to justify my counsel, "Stay *outside* the immeasurable Church of England." Why, even Archdeacon Farrar would, I am sure, agree with me. He said in a speech at a meeting of the National Protestant Church Union, in this very month of May, that "seven thousand of the Anglican clergy were avowed supporters of the Romeward movement;" while at the same meeting the Dean of Norwich expressed a hope that the Evangelical party should so live and act that "the onlooker, comparing the Evangelicals with the Ritualists, would be compelled to say that the Evangelicals had out-preached them, out-prayed them, out-worked them, outlived them," and this too in the same Church of England!

Now just see what it all means. Archdeacon Farrar said that there were in the Church of England 5043 Ritualist churches. In these churches "sacerdotalism" is triumphant. And "sacerdotalism" means a priesthood divinely appointed to offer sacrifice, and divinely appointed to absolve from sin in the Sacrament of Penance. One-third, therefore, of

all the clergy are committed to "sacerdotalism;" while two-thirds are committed to the sound old Protestant tradition, that sacerdotalism is idolatrous and superstitious. When Macaulay described the Church of England as "a hundred sects battling within one Church," he never conceived of this ultimate development of two extremes. Had he done so we can imagine the scathing irony with which he would have made some such remark as, "In one and the same Church all the principles of Roman Catholicism, with the exception only of the principle of obedience, are blended with the principles of rabid Protestantism, and with the religious fanaticism of the conventicle or the Salvation Army." Macaulay had only known of old-fashioned High Churchmen—such men as Hooker, Laud, Andrews, or Taylor, or, later still, Pusey or Keble, who were no more like the modern Ritualists than a country gentleman is like a Franciscan, or than "Dearly beloved brethren" is like the Mass. Yet if in a few years such stupendous changes have been brought about, we may well ask, will the High Church party in the course of another

few years make their submission corporately to the Roman Church? (Cries of "No, no, never," and "They will only make their submission to themselves.")

The President. Our subject being the Reunion of the Churches, may I ask you, did the Church Congress you have referred to furnish valuable suggestions on this point?

The Broad Church Delegate. Very valuable suggestions. Thus one speaker, the Rev. Lewis Hughes, was so superbly magnanimous in his theology that he asked, "Is it not possible for Dr. Mackennal, Dr. Lunn, General Booth, and the Bishop of Lincoln, not only to shake hands, but to work together in the same fold under one Head?" Another speaker, a layman, proposed the courtly experiment of inviting Dissenting Ministers into Anglican pulpits; though whether for the purpose of preaching against the Church of England was not stated by this too amiable Churchman. A third speaker, the Archbishop of York—though I am not quite sure that this was at the very same Conference—said in my hearing that he rejoiced that "the *same* Bible was accepted by all An-

glicans and by all Dissenters;" his Grace however forgetting to mention that, while all Englishmen accepted the same Bible, there were thirty-six million Interpreters, each of whom created his creed for himself. A fourth speaker, the Bishop of Worcester, did *not* think that "all the Churches must be absorbed in the Church of England," and his Lordship added, "I fully recognize Non-Conformist bodies as Churches." And lastly, lest it should for a moment be supposed that Reunion was at all likely to be proximate, Dr. Lunn was very careful to lay it down that "the work they had taken in hand was not a light work; it was a serious matter, and it might take *many generations* to accomplish." From which it was evident that neither you, my Dissenting friends, nor I myself, are likely to derive benefit from a Reunion which our great-grandchildren will have small hope of seeing realized, say, fifty or a hundred and fifty years hence. (A voice: "You have been three hundred years about it already! Why not wait till the end of the world?")

The President. Was there not a second Con-

gress held at Rhyl, with the express object of converting Welsh Dissenters to the Church of England? Surely at this second Congress there must have been valuable suggestions, which might help us in the task we have before us?

The Broad Church Delegate. If the suggestions, sir, were not valuable, they were original. I remember that one of the speakers, Mr. Harwood, perfectly charmed me with his all-embracing catholicity; for he said: "I do not want to abolish Dissent, but to absorb it. I do not see why the Church should not have room for a still greater variety than it possesses. We are too monotonous in character. We want Churchmen who are *plus* something —such as Churchmen *plus* Methodists." I was much struck by this really genuinely new conception, and I concluded that the speaker's passion for variety must be insatiable, indeed abysmal; for "an Anglican *plus* Baptist," or a "Ritualist *plus* Quaker," implied a nobility of comprehensiveness I had not imagined. I vividly recall also two other "suggestions." Thus, the Principal of Cheltenham College argued in this way — though I cannot now

recall his exact language—that while schism was unquestionably very heinous, it was impossible to say who was a schismatic; the Non-Conformists not esteeming themselves to be schismatics, and therefore—as it would seem—not being schismatics. I was much charmed by this simple test of the fact of schism. It seemed to reduce the "sin of schism" to pure fiction; for no schismatic ever yet allowed that he was in schism, and therefore no schismatic could by possibility be a schismatic. And so "Reunion" was left quite without meaning, since it was impossible that there should be Reunion of non-schismatics. And may I just mention, while speaking of this Congress, how astonished I was when the Master of Keble College read a paper of which the title was "the *duty* of fasting;" for, to speak truly, I had not known that it was a "duty." And it was a gratification to me, soon afterward, to find that an Anglican bishop was also as ignorant upon the subject as I was myself. You remember that when the Bishop of Ely "dispensed" his clergy and laity from the duty of fasting during Lent—on account of the prevailing influ-

enza—the Bishop of Rochester was asked by his clergy and laity to kindly concede to them the same boon. He replied that he would have been happy to do so, but that he had never heard that Lent-fasting was a Church ordinance; and he therefore could not see the need of a dispensation. (Much laughter.) However, we must excuse bishops for not being "well up" in these little matters; for even Convocation has only quite recently debated whether it be a "duty" *not* to go to communion after breakfast.

And now it only remains that I ask you: Have I justified my counsel, "Stay *outside* the all-containing Church of England?" (Laughter, and cries of "No, no," "Yes, yes.") You will tell me that I have not done anything toward Reunion. But *real* Reunion is confessedly impossible; and a Reunion that should be fictitious would be degrading. A Reunion in the rough sense of external corporateness or nomenclature—and this is what I call a "fictitious" union—would mean that Dissenters should consent to belong to a particular body, on the condition that they might believe as they did before; and it would mean more-

over that the body to which they should profess an overt adherence should remain just precisely what it always was, "a net to catch all fish except Papists." I say, then, *why* should Non-Conformists submit themselves to the Established Church, of which the chief overseers, the archbishop and bishops, proclaim that it *includes* most of the prominent Dissenting views; includes those who believe in episcopacy and those who do not believe in it; includes the Bishop of Lincoln who "says Mass," and the Protestant Associations which abhor Mass; includes the members of the Privy Council and the editors of the Ritualist newspapers; includes—if I may respectfully mention it—Her Majesty the Head of the Church, who frequents indifferently Presbyterian and Anglican places of worship, and the extremest Ritualists who call Presbyterians heretics; includes the alpha and omega of the whole range of religious opinion, from transcendental quasi-Popery to rabid Puritanism? Do you call it Reunion to give the same name to scores of sectaries who all continue to cherish their own creed in their inmost heart, and not one of

whom has any more respect for an Anglican clergyman's theology than he has for his private politics or taste in hats? I do not call this Reunion; I call it the complete sacrifice of self-respect, with the abandonment of manly honor and consistency. No: I believe in Reunion, but not of this kind. I believe in the frank admission by all Protestants that they trust to their own opinions and to nothing else; and I maintain that if we could all of us plainly confess this, and leave off abusing one another for not agreeing with us, we might then grasp each other's hand in a true Reunion; a Reunion of common sense and of perfect integrity; a Reunion in first principles—those of believing in our own judgment, and respecting the same belief in all our brethren.

(Partial cheering, with several curious and abrupt comments, followed this plausible attempt to "find a solution." The President, however, at once rose from his arm-chair; and, as though he were anxious to avoid criticism of the last speech, said hastily: "I will now ask you to listen to the Rev. Sebastian Stole, who is well known as the learned and profound

author of a recent work, entitled 'The Church of England the only Primitive Catholic Church.'" A sensible wave of enkindled interest immediately passed over the vast assembly; and every one seemed to feel that the fresh prospect of original views might be refreshing after the obvious failure of the last two speakers.)

The Rev. Sebastian Stole. It has been with deep pain that I have listened to Canon Courtly, and with still deeper pain to Dr. Wylde. I had hoped that the revival of Catholic principles in this country had, to a certain extent, elevated Anglican Protestantism, as well as leavened all the sects of Non-Conformism; so that it would be no far reach from the rehabilitation of the Church of England to the resurrection of the sects to primitive truth. Suffer me to speak for a moment of myself. "Ritualist" as I am called, all the world knows that Ritualism is only the formal presentation of Catholicity. I care not for signs or watchwords, or for the *mise-en-scène* of Christian worship, save so far as they may be didactic of dogmatic truths; which need to be clothed,

to be languaged, in a becoming formalism, so that the natural and the supernatural man may apprehend them. My first principles are unity, charity, catholicity; and though unhappily separate at the present time from my Roman brethren, the gulf is the result of historic accidents; it is not my fault, my offence. I wish to speak plainly on this subject. Dissenters, I know, say to me, "You are yourself a Dissenter—a Dissenter within the big sect of the Church of England," and they think that they are logical, or at least that they talk common sense, when they ridicule me for pretending to be a Catholic, while all the while I am only an imitator of Catholic forms, and a Protestant as regards both Popery and Low Churchism. Now let me ask you—and without rudeness or presumption—do you think that you understand my true position? (Some vulgar person in the crowd: "No, nor you yourself either.") That position may be briefly stated as follows. In the earlier ages Christians accepted Catholic truth as it became formulated by the authority of general councils. Gradually, as the centuries rolled on, there

REV. JAMES A. GRANT BEQUEST TO
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY, 1928

crept into the Church many novelties, and among these novelties was the arrogant assumption of the Bishop of Rome to be not only chief pastor but despotic ruler. This assumption was resisted through the Middle Ages, was finally vanquished and routed in the sixteenth century, and is now exclusively approved by the Roman Church, which is seeking to make headway in this country. Unhappily, with the assumption of the supreme dictatorship, other errors of kindred extravagance grew apace; so that the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century may be said to have been a living body, terribly sickened by natural infirmities, human decay. Then came the great Protestant Revolution. But the Reformers overdid their reforming work. They swept away much truth with much error. Begotten mainly by purely secular motives, and conducted by purely secular weapons, the Reformation, both under Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth, made use of the axe, not the pruning-knife; so that it lopped off healthy branches from the Catholic tree, though happily leaving the Catholic root undisturbed. Then followed three centuries of

Erastianism; three centuries of dull, arid, sleepy Protestantism; until, at the time of the Oxford movement, the new life of Catholicity restored the Church of England to primitive truth. The Ritualists are the legitimate heirs of primitive truth, as they have been its earnest revivers or reintroducers. Yet we have still a great work to bring to perfection. A few more years, and the Church of England will be solidly Catholic; solidly primitive, united, and, I hope, perfect. Meanwhile, we must bear the brunt of persecution; we must bear the travesty of the Privy Council sitting in judgment; we must bear the ludicrous attacks and the puerile inanities of Protestant alliances and associations, and the wretched ineptitude of both our archbishops and bishops. Canon Courtly and Dr. Wylde have both dwelt on this ineptitude; though to *them* it is only a matter for quiet contempt, while to *us* it is a cause of sorrow and humiliation. Still, this ineptitude can only last a short time; in a few years we shall have Catholic bishops, Catholic archbishops; and we shall present to the world the grand spectacle of a Primitive Church, re-

born out of the ashes of corrupt Romanism, and out of the débris of an equally worn-out and effete Protestantism.

Now it only remains that I contribute my counsel toward the "solution," which our President has earnestly asked us to try to find. Reunion is indeed a great, a joyous word; and the *fact* of a Catholic Reunion would be more joyous still. But whereas the Low Church Delegate has said to you, "Come at once into the comprehensive Church of England;" and the Broad Church Delegate has said to you, "Do not come in, but strive for a better social *modus vivendi;*" *I* say to you, *Wait*. *Wait* for a few years before you join us. *Wait* till we are wholly united in one body. *Wait*, till when you come into the Church of England you may know for certain what it is you are coming into. (The vulgar person here remarked, "Wait till we have turned up our toes in a church-yard.") In about another dozen years we shall be ready for you. In the mean time, I beg you to study Ritualist works; try to acquire some little knowledge of Catholic principles; try to learn to believe in the Holy

Mass, and in the Seven Sacraments, which are now—or will be shortly—Anglican verities. You will thus be getting ready for the great Reunion. And as it is reasonably certain that the next Archbishop of Canterbury, instead of being a heretic, will be a Catholic; and that the appointment of future bishops will be taken out of the hands of the Prime Minister, and will be lodged in those of an orthodox council of Ritualist clergy (the vulgar person again suggested: "The Ritualist Jurisdiction Company, Limited"); you will have the happiness in a few years of making your submission to the Catholic Church; not to a Church as it is at present, half primitive and half modern; half devoted to Catholic doctrines and Catholic practices, and half distracted by the private caprices of wilful Protestants—but to the one living, primitive, perfect Church of England; the sole repository of the Apostolic faith and doctrine—of the sentiment, love, devotion of the Ancient Church.

(For some moments the audience seemed to be bewildered, but they soon broke out into merry laughter; the "baser sort" of the lis-

teners indulging in a class of comments which were natural under the provocation of such rhapsody, but which could hardly be discreetly transferred to this report. A few minutes passed while the President, conversing with the other delegates, appeared to be considering on whom he should next call for wise counsel. Then, turning to the delegate for the Wesleyans, he said, with an obvious pleasure in the anticipation: "May I beg you, sir, to reply to the Ritualist Delegate?")

The Rev. Walter Sterling (who was a distinguished and highly intelligent-looking man, and who seemed to have a sort of reserve fund of power, as though he were not disposed to be in a hurry over his purpose) looked straight at the Rev. Sebastian Stole and said to him: May I ask you, sir, *who* gave you the authority to restore the Church of England to Catholicity; to undo all the work of the Reformers; and to decide for your archbishops and your bishops, as well as for the population of this realm, what is the sole truth as to all doctrine and all worship, "all sentiment, love, devotion of the Ancient Church"?

Rev. Sebastian Stole (after a pause, which betrayed a surprise at such a direct appeal). *I* have no such power. It is the Catholic authority of the Early Church which has that power.

The Wesleyan. Very good. And *who*, pray, is the representative in your Church of this Catholic authority of the Early Church?

The Ritualist. At present, unhappily, there is no visible representative; at least no corporate, united representative, save only the body of the Catholic clergy.

The Wesleyan. I see. And *who* appointed this "body of the Catholic clergy"—by which you mean the Ritualist clergy in the Establishment—to be the sole, infallible judge of primitive truth?

The Ritualist. There is no need of any "appointment" in the case. It rests with a Catholic clergy to teach the truth.

The Wesleyan. With the rectors and the curates, or with the bishops and the archbishops?

The Ritualist. Properly with the bishops and archbishops in council assembled.

The Wesleyan. And have the bishops and the archbishops in council assembled justified you in all your Ritualistic teaching?

The Ritualist. They have not done so as yet; but this is the unhappy result of three centuries of Protestantism, which have so lowered the tone of Catholicity in this country that it is difficult to find a bishop who is not a heretic.

The Wesleyan. Who says that any one of your bishops is a heretic?

The Ritualist. The great majority of the present Anglican bishops are out of harmony with primitive Catholic teaching.

The Wesleyan. Who says so?

The Ritualist. The Primitive Church would say so, if it could now speak.

The Wesleyan. But as it cannot speak, who is the interpreter of the Voice that cannot be heard?

The Ritualist (after a pause which was almost painful to the audience). I see your drift, and I admit that there is no living interpreter who is authorized by a legitimately constituted authority; yet my answer is, that though the

Primitive Voice cannot be *heard*, the Primitive Writings can be *read;* and these writings are sufficiently clear as to primitive truth.

The Wesleyan. Who is your interpreter of these writings?

The Ritualist. The consensus of the early Doctors of the Church.

The Wesleyan. Then you make the Early Doctors to interpret their own writings; and you make yourself to be the interpreter of their interpretation?

The Ritualist. I do not see that there is any need of a second interpreter.

The Wesleyan. You are aware, sir, that these very writings, on which you profess to rely, are interpreted by the Roman Catholic Church in a sense wholly different to that which you put upon them; and this, too, not only as to two or three doctrines, but I may say as to the whole scope of theology; at least, as to all questions of authority and final appeal, as well as to the character of Christian worship. You are aware also that the Reformers interpreted them variously; and so did the Caroline and Georgian clergy. You are

aware that the bishops and clergy of your own communion have never been able to agree, during three centuries, as to what was the definite interpretation to be put upon them. Finally, you are aware that, at this very day, the bishops and clergy of your own communion are so divided as to what was the teaching of the Primitive Church, that each man may be said to be *his own* Primitive Church, in the sense that he not only interprets it but creates it. Now, sir, I return once more to my question: *Who* is your authority for all the doctrines you teach, in regard to the interpretation of Patristic Writings?

The Ritualist (after another painful pause). I am not aware of any living authority on the subject.

The Wesleyan. So that it comes to this: You take upon yourself to teach your own Church, to teach the Roman Church, to teach all Non-Conformists, myself included, what is the alone, primitive, Catholic Creed; while you are forced to admit that you have no more authority than I have, for each one, or for every one, of your doctrines. Now I knew

this; but I wanted the audience to hear you say it. I wanted the audience to apprehend the absolute nullity of that authority on the strength of which you propose to dictate terms of communion. You, sir, have no authority beyond your own private judgment; and I therefore, for myself, decline to "wait" till you have reconstituted the doctrine, worship, and devotion of the Church of England; or to submit my conscience to an arbiter who is on a level with myself in the claim to be the best judge of his own orthodoxy. (General cheering, with a mixture of disappointment and irritation on the part of the High Church Anglicans in the hall.)

The Ritualist Delegate. You make one grand mistake in your reasoning, because you ignore the primary distinction in our positions. The Ritualists claim to be the heirs of the primitive teachers. Non-Conformists make no such claim, but rely exclusively on their interpretation of the Scriptures.

The Wesleyan. You are in error, sir, in asserting that Non-Conformists ignore the authority of the primitive writers and teachers of

the Christian Church. They only do precisely what you do: choose their period, and use their own sense in interpretation. And as to the interpretation of the Scriptures, they also do precisely what you do—with this indeed highly important distinction: *they* accept the Scriptures as the sole deposit of Divine Truth, and put the writings of the early Christians into a secondary place. *You* interpret the Scriptures to your own liking, while you also do the same with all Christian writers, whom you nevertheless call your sole doctrinal interpreters in regard to the doctrinal meaning of the Scriptures. Thus you double the difficulties of private judgment, by interpreting *both* the Scriptures and their interpreters. Indeed, I must be permitted to state the case with more amplitude. You, the Ritualists, not only interpret the Scriptures and the Early Writers, but you also interpret the whole of Catholic teaching: you interpret the Councils, the Saints, the Doctors, the spiritual mystics; the early, the mediæval, the modern commentators; nay, the Church throughout all time and in all lands. You sit as supreme judge over past and pres-

ent; and, while affecting to respect only authority, you summon to your bar all pontiffs and all hierarchies, and distribute your awards or sentences at your own sweet will. You, the Ritualists, are in short the impersonation of Divine authority, while affecting to obey an authority which does not exist. You are perpetually talking about the dead and buried Primitive Church, which you have resuscitated, each one of you, in your inmost self; and which you "obey" because you can make it teach just what you like. Now I call this the ultimate grotesqueness of Catholic parody. Not one authority, but a thousand authorities in one—that one being your individual, judicial self—is the supreme imposture of this modern Ritualist sham. (Cries of "Too strong: apologize, apologize.") I apologize, sir, for using too plain language; but since I am charged with ignoring the authority of Primitive Writers—with preferring my own authority to that of the dead—I am obliged to rejoin that *I* at least do not profess to obey an authority which I have absorbed into the inner consciousness of my self-suffi-

ciency. (Cries of "Oh, oh," with various comments.)

The President. Very interesting as is this discussion, it is rather a wandering from our purpose. I desire to bring the reverend speaker back to the original question: How shall we find a solution of sectarian differences?

The Wesleyan. I thank you, sir, for recalling me to the main question; yet I venture to say respectfully that the attitude of the last speaker was absolutely fatal to that question: indeed it narrowed the whole controversy to this alternative: "Ritualism, or no religion at all." Now I, for one, sincerely respect Roman Catholics who say to me, "Obey the Catholic Church, as I do;" but I cannot believe in the mental consistency—as to the moral consistency, I should not presume to express any opinion—of those who say to me, "Obey *me*, for I alone am the truthful interpreter of the Catholic faith." I should as soon think of obeying the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, however, never affects to teach anybody; and who lives only to cherish the worldly-wise principle, *quieta non movere*, as of submitting

to a new authority, which cannot trace its own origin; does not know who was its father, or who its mother; only exists by the repudiation of three centuries of Protestant ancestry, as well as of a dozen centuries of Roman Catholicism, and by tagging itself on to what it calls the Early Church, which it affirms to have been dead and buried before Constantine. ("No, no," from the Ritualist Delegate.) Well, sir, will you fix the date of the demise of that primitive authority to which you cling as your sole guide in matters of faith?

The Ritualist Delegate. There was no demise. There was only a subsequent incrustation of error.

The Wesleyan. Pardon me if I repeat that statement to the audience: "There was no demise of the authority; there was only a subsequent incrustation of error." It follows, therefore, that the same authority justified the incrustation of error which had justified the teaching of truth; that the same authority which had taught apostolic truth in the first centuries taught soul-destroying heresies in the following centuries; so that, as the

Anglican Homilies express it, "By the space of eight hundred years and more, laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children of the whole of Christendom were drowned in abominable idolatry." This same authority again, at the time of the Reformation, turned the whole Christian system upside down; and as though this were not enough in the way of fickleness, this same authority has now reversed the Reformation, or reformed the Reformation into Ritualism. I believe this is what is called by the Ritualists "Continuity," or the continuousness of an identity which was lost. We hear a good deal in these days of this Continuity; and as the assumption trenches closely upon our subject—the Ritualists refusing to us Non-Conformists the Continuity which they say gives them the right to teach us—I may be justified in lingering upon it for one moment. Briefly, this hypothesis of Continuity stands thus: The early ages, so say the Ritualists, were *not* Roman Catholic. The middle ages *were* most certainly Roman Catholic. The first three hundred years after the

Reformation were Protestant. The last forty years have been the same as Primitive Christianity. Thus Continuity involves three mighty changes. The Church of Christ began with a pure Christianity. That was a fair start. Change 1, it was transformed into Roman Catholicism. Change 2, it was transformed into intense Protestantism. Change 3, it was transformed into Ritualism—which is assumed to be Primitive Christianity. This is Continuity: the Continuity of the admittedly non-continuous, or of the three-times-turned-completely-upside-down Christianity. And the Ritualists are the sole heirs of this Continuity. They are the sole heirs, that is, of the Primitive Authority; which—having changed its mind about the fourth or fifth century, and turned Roman Catholic for twelve centuries, then changed its mind in the sixteenth century and turned Protestant, and then again changed its mind in the nineteenth century, and turned Ritualist—is still the one, sole, Divine authority for teaching unchangeable truth, and is now possessed solely by the Ritualists. Sir, I cannot ask my brother Wesleyans to turn Rit-

ualists. (Laughter.) I can understand the claim of an authority to be Divine, if that authority have never reversed its own teaching; but an authority which has three times reversed its own teaching—and it is the Ritualists who assert this, not I—has no more claim to be Divine than has a weathercock. I could as soon——

The Ritualist. I am sorry to interrupt you, but you are confusing two things, which are quite distinct: authority, and the abuses of authority. Two out of the three great changes you have alluded to, in illustrating what you suppose to be Continuity, sprang from the abuses, not from the authority; the Divine institution of authority remaining intact.

The Wesleyan. If there were abuses of authority, the authority must have been responsible for the abuses; nay more, the very authority itself must have been an abuse; for the abuses of a teaching authority cannot possibly be external to that authority; they must be necessarily internal, inherent; since, if it be the province of a teaching authority to teach

truths, and that authority teach lies instead of truths, it is the authority itself which is criminal, and which is thus proved to be no Divine authority at all. For my part, I do not believe in the Divine authority of a teaching Church, and I am therefore independent of your hypothesis; but for you, sir, who do believe in it, there is the obligation of demonstrating how an authority which is divinely appointed to teach the truth can be perpetually contradicting itself through the ages.

(No answer being given, there were cries of "Answer, answer," until the Ritualist Delegate, who had taken time to consider, replied by the very sensible observation:)

The Ritualist. An authority could only always be exempt from doctrinal change provided that authority were infallible. The Church of England does not attribute Infallibility to the Catholic Church—subsequently to the age called Apostolic.

The Wesleyan. Good. Then if the Teaching Church, which succeeded to the Apostolic age, was not infallible, in what sense can you call it a Teaching Church?

The Ritualist. As the authoritative successor to the Apostolic age.

The Wesleyan. Authoritative in the sense that it *might* teach lies, or might, by a happy chance, teach some truths?

The Ritualist. Fallibility certainly implies that the Church *might* teach lies; and history, I fear, shows that it has done so; yet had Christendom not merited the awful punishment of authoritative falsehood, it is quite certain that so great a scourge would not have been inflicted.

The Wesleyan. And who merited this scourge of authoritative falsehood: the Teaching Church or the Taught Church?

The Ritualist. Probably both. It is an awful mystery.

The Wesleyan. I confess I do not see any mystery at all; I only see the most outrageous absurdity. On *my* theory—that there is not, and never was, one divinely appointed teaching authority—there is no need to be always casting about for apologies; but on *your* theory—that there is, and always was, one divinely appointed Teaching Church—there is a perfect

smashing of both the Divine equity and of common sense. You say that the Divine Founder of the Christian Church appointed one authority to teach the truth. This authority must be of course always living, always audible; otherwise it can be no authority at all. No sooner does your Divine authority get well started, than—if I may be pardoned the familiar expression—it goes to the bad; so that "for eight hundred years and more" that authority which was to teach truth; which was to condemn with the sharpest precision the slightest heresy; which was to stand out like a city set on a hill, and whose voice was to be trumpet-tongued through the ages—has done nothing but stumble from one falsehood to another, from superstition to idolatry, from heresy to apostasy; until at last the poor old impostor, worn out probably by old age, is obliged to ask a few Ritualists in a northern island called England to kindly undertake its reconstruction, and see whether it be not possible to dress it up in some borrowed clothes, so as to make it look respectable before it dies. (Much laughter, with discordant cries and hisses.)

The President. I have been unwilling to interrupt you, yet I must assume, from the tenor of your censures, that you do not wish for any reconciliation with the Church of England. Now as reconciliation was the one object of this council, I believe I only express the general opinion of the audience, when I say that you have frustrated that object. (Some cheering, with suppressed ironical observations.)

The Wesleyan. To prove to you, sir, how thoroughly in earnest I am in my desire for reconciliation with the Church of England, I pledge you my honor that I will be received into the Church of England to-morrow—if any one can tell me what the Church of England *is.*

(A few minutes having passed, and no answer having been given to this challenge, the delegate proceeded:)

Well, sir, I will be more generous still. I pledge you my honor that I will be received into the Church of England to-morrow, if any one can even prove to me that the Church of England *exists.*

(Much laughter, with calls upon the Anglican Delegate to "reply." The Ritualist Delegate remaining seated, some of the audience made a call for "the Low Church Delegate;" and the invitation, after a pause, was accepted.)

The Low Church Delegate (who rose with a genial smile, and was evidently more amused than he was pained). I am the happy possessor of a benefice in the Church of England; indeed, to speak truly, I have two benefices; and I have also a canonry in one of our beautiful cathedrals; so I believe I may answer for at least the *existence* of the institution which, as we all know, is called the Church of England.

The Wesleyan. You could not have expressed the fact better: "The institution which is called the Church of England." But it was not the existence of the *institution* I wanted proved—we all know the fact of that existence—it was the existence of the *Church*, the Church of England. May I ask you to prove the existence of the Church?

The Low Church Delegate. I should have

thought that the existence of the institution was the same thing with the existence of the Church; since the institution could have no reason of being, except in the fact that it was a Church.

The Wesleyan. Pardon me, but that is to beg the question. I must ask you, first, to define for me what is "the Church;" and next to show that the "institution called the Church of England" fulfils the requirements of the definition. If you can do this, I have pledged myself to become an Anglican.

The Low Church Delegate (after a pause). As to the definition of a Church—I cannot use the definite article, *the* Church, in the sense in which a Ritualist would use it—I should say that it was an association of Christians who were bound together by a common belief and a common worship. And as to the Church of England being *a* Church, I should imagine that the common acceptance of its Articles and its Formularies, together with the common acceptance of its form of worship, would entitle it to be regarded as a Church.

The Wesleyan Delegate. I regret that I have

to prove you wrong out of your own mouth. An hour or so ago, you were arguing on this very platform that, because the Archbishop of Canterbury—who is the head of the Establishment, and who may be supposed therefore to know something about its teaching—approved everything that everybody believed about everything, therefore there could be no reason why Non-Conformists of all shades should not come inside the Archbishop's happy family. May I ask you how you reconcile this wild luxuriance of heretical pravity—this fact of every man being his own Supreme Pontiff—with the "*common*" acceptance of a doctrinal standard, and the "*common*" acceptance of a prescribed ritual? I am quite disposed to accept your definition that "a Church is an association of Christians who are bound together by a common belief and a common worship;" but since you have proved in regard to the Church of England—and the Broad Church Delegate proved the fact quite as lucidly as you did, in his able exhortation to Non-Conformists to "stop outside"—that there is no such thing as a common belief in the Church of England,

how do you prove that the Church of England is a Church?

The Low Church Delegate. I admit that there are immeasurable varieties of interpretation; still I would hazard the opinion that the existence of prescribed Formularies, to which the clergy are bound to assent at their ordination, presupposes some accord in point of doctrine.

The Wesleyan Delegate. Presupposes! I am aware that the Church of England presupposes everything; and that, to begin with, it presupposes its own existence. But now, sir, if you will allow me, I want to ask you this question—which properly I ought to ask of the Ritualist Delegate, since it is with his principles, not with yours, I am contending: Does the existence of Formularies prove the existence of *the* Church, of the one only authoritative Church of this country, apart from these three primary requisites: (1) authority to prescribe Formularies; (2) authority to interpret Formularies; (3) authority to compel obedience, or to excommunicate?

The Low Church Delegate. You are now

taking me outside my particular province. *I* am the Low Church Delegate, not the Ritualist Delegate; and I do not believe in Church authority in a doctrinal sense, I only believe in it in the sense of conventional harmony. Pray refer to the Ritualist Delegate for an answer to academic questions, which he alone in this council can properly formulate.

The Ritualist Delegate. Will the Wesleyan Delegate kindly reconstruct his question?

The Wesleyan Delegate. My assertion being that the Church of England does not exist—in the sense, that is, of the Authoritative Teaching Body—I ask: (1) Where is your authority to prescribe Formularies? (2) Where is your authority to interpret Formularies? (3) Where is your authority to compel obedience, or to excommunicate?

The Ritualist Delegate. It would be insincere in me to give any other answer than that, though the Church *ought* to possess all such powers, at present they are usurped by the Houses of Parliament, which are supreme even over the Houses of Convocation. As *The Guardian* newspaper—a most respecta-

ble organ, though not sufficiently "advanced" to meet my views—expressed the truth in the year 1890: "Not one jot or one tittle of the Prayer-Book can be varied except with the consent of Parliament." And again, the same organ stated, "once the supremacy was royal; now it is parliamentary. Once it was exercised by an anointed king; now it is exercised by a minister of any or no religion, who is virtually elected by a majority in a House of Commons, which is itself composed of men of all religions or none." This is indeed an awful truth, but it is a truth. I look forward to a happier time, when the "union of Church and State" will not mean "the State dominant over the Church," but the Church teaching the State, as well as all Englishmen, what is the Truth once delivered to the saints.

The Wesleyan Delegate. I am charmed with the candor of your admission, though I cannot congratulate you on the hopefulness of your prospects. (Laughter.) I will take your answer, however, as it stands; and I now proceed to prove to you that the Church of England

does not exist—in the sense, that is, that Ritualists put upon the word "Church." I am obliged to argue on hypothesis; for, unfortunately for Ritualists, there is no reconciling First Principles with painfully obvious facts or realizations.

Now this so-called Church of England presumes to dictate to Non-Conformists, on the ground that it has ecclesiastical authority. This assumption is of course limited to High Churchmen, Low Churchmen being mere Dissenters *plus* Episcopacy. And this authority the High Church party seeks to justify by three claims, not one of which is advanced by Non-Conformists: (1) that it inherits the authority of the Early Church; (2) that by this inheritance it can decide what is dogmatic truth with a better warranty than can the Roman or the Greek Church; (3) that it possesses the Apostolical Succession; and by that possession has the right to say to Non-Conformists, "*You* have no true clergy, you have only ministers, pastors, or preachers." My reply to these three claims is as follows:

(1) This claim of the Church of England to

inherit the authority of the Early Church is pure assumption and is contradicted by fact; for an inheritance must come by lawful heirship, it cannot be appropriated at our own caprice; and no authority throughout the whole world has ever said to the Protestant Establishment, "*You* are the lawful heir of the Early Church, and all other claimants to the heritage are impostors."

(2) The authority therefore to dogmatize in matters of faith is only self-conferred or imaginary; it is an authority which was created by Henry VIII. and by Queen Elizabeth; and the penalties for not accepting that new authority were fines, deprivations, imprisonment, and death. The two Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity—fathered by Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth—were the sole parents of the authority of the Anglican Church; the House of Commons and the House of Lords were its godfathers, and this too with reluctance and under compulsion; and, as Abbot Feckenham of Westminster told the House of Lords, when they were pusillanimously discussing the Royal Pleasure, "they would apostatize from that

faith which had been the religion of this island for no less than 1400 years, and would set up a new religion and a new authority." The Church of England, therefore, by the admission of its contemporaries, has no more claim to be heir to Primitive Authority than enforced Acts of Parliament could accord to it; Acts of Parliament passed under such crushing royal tyranny, that Henry VIII. put to death 72,000 persons—the noble Fisher and the heroic More at their head—within a few months after proclaiming himself to be Pope; and in Queen Elizabeth's time, the Lords, after fearful pressure, could only secure a frightened majority of *three* for the horribly cruel Act of Uniformity; while the Commons, as Froude relates, would never have passed the Act at all, "had not Cecil 'flung the question into a garboyle,' and carried his point in the confusion." The whole bench of English bishops in Elizabeth's time—the trimming Kitchen of Landaff excepted—denounced the bill, and resolutely opposed it; and the clergy, as a body, in spite of Elizabeth's threats, stood firmly by the Roman Catholic bishops. Heath, Archbishop of York

—in the vacancy of Canterbury the acting and responsible Primate of the English Church—protested in the House of Lords in these words —and I quote them only to show how the Ritualist theory of Continuity was repudiated by the real heirs of the Roman Church: "If by this relinquishing of the See of Rome there was none other matter than a withdrawal of our obedience from the Pope's person, Paul, the fourth of that name, . . . then the cause were not of such great importance, as it is in very deed, when, by the relinquishing and forsaking the See of Rome, we must forsake and flee these four things: all General Councils; all canonical and ecclesiastical laws of the Church of Christ; the judgment of all Christian princes; and we must forsake and flee the unity of the Christian Church; and by leaping out of Peter's ship hazard ourselves to be overwhelmed and drowned in the waters of schism, sects, and divisions." Now, as a civil government, a Parliamentary government, a worldly and Queen-fearing government could have no more to do with a spiritual jurisdiction than it could have to do with the occu-

pations of the angels, it follows that Queen Elizabeth's Church appropriated an authority which, if it ever belonged to the early Church, could not by lawful heritage belong to *her*. And (3) as to the Apostolic Succession, neither the Roman Church nor the Greek Church, nor even the obscure Syrian body in Western India, allow that the Church of England possesses it; while most of the Reformers and three-fourths of the early Anglicans regarded it as not essential to a true ministry, and as rather savoring of priesthood—which they abhorred.

I affirm therefore that the Church of England *does not exist;* that there is not and cannot be such a Church—and remember, I pray you, that I am arguing with the Ritualists, with the sole view of demonstrating *their* fallacies—and I defy the Ritualists to prove that there is such a Church; though it is easy to prove the existence of the Establishment. But the Establishment is not the Church; any more than Acts of Parliament are spiritual dogmas, or than Queen Elizabeth was the legitimate daughter of Henry VIII., or had the power to

create a faith and to enforce it. And now, sir (and here the delegate turned to the President), I wish to propose to the Ritualist Delegate these three questions; and if he can satisfactorily answer them I will make my submission to his Establishment: (1) Can the Church of England be said to exist—exist, remember, as that *one* divinely appointed institution, which is to teach both all Anglicans and all Dissenters, ay, and to teach the Roman Church and the Greek Church—when the very authority from which it professes to have sprung had been dead and buried for upward of ten centuries at the time when Queen Elizabeth feigned to exhume it; dead and buried, that is, as a teaching authority; for an authority which could teach lies for "eight hundred years and more"—lies upon almost every doctrine, every devotion—could not possibly be said to be a living authority; it was not only dead, it was corrupt, it was an offence to the very memory of all good Christians. (2) Could, then, this dead authority suddenly jump up again into life; suddenly resume the Divine position of the Alone Teacher; and this too with no new

mission, no new dispensation, but by the omnipotent divinity of an illegitimate sovereign, who could only reign by creating a brand-new Church? And when the Ritualists—for it is with them I am arguing—have answered these two questions; when they have solved the difficulty of a Lying authority being a Divine authority, and of a therefore Dead authority becoming a Living authority; with the two additional difficulties of their being themselves heirs to this dead authority, and of their being omnipotent to rekindle its Divine life; then let them tell me, (3) how an Apostolic Succession, which was passed down the Roman Church through many centuries, can by possibility have devolved upon Anglican clergymen; seeing that that very Succession was always associated in the Catholic mind with three things which were never known in the Church of England: (1) The Sacrifice of the Mass, (2) the Perpetual Presence upon the altar, and (3) Absolution in the Catholic Sacrament of Penance. If it were possible, even historically, that that Apostolic Succession which was called the pledge of true sacrifice, true absolution—

for this, remember, is the belief of High Churchmen—could devolve upon clergymen who, up to the time of the Oxford Movement, anathematized *both* Sacrifice and Absolution; yet, morally, such an identity would so shock the sense of fitness, that to believe in it would make Christianity ridiculous. That the Anglican clergy have not the Roman priesthood is proved by their never having done anything that the Roman priesthood always did; never offered the Sacrifice; never bent the knee before the Presence; never sat in the tribunal of penance; and also by their having always shunned and deprecated virginity—which to Catholic priests seemed the fitting state for their office. And finally, how could it be possible that throughout the long reign of Elizabeth—ay, and in many a year after she was dead—the very priesthood which was Roman Catholic, and which therefore had the true Succession according to the sincere conviction of the modern Ritualists, should have been hanged, drawn, and quartered for saying Mass; and that the Roman Catholic party should have been imprisoned and financially ruined for dar-

ing to attend at a Catholic altar or at a Catholic confessional, or even so much as to give shelter to a Catholic priest; while all the while these very Anglican authorities who were so bitterly persecuting the Catholic Faithful believed in the very *same* holy Mass which they were holding up to the execration of all mankind, and in the very *same* Sacrifice, Presence, and Penance which these martyrs were cruelly tortured for insisting upon? Entertaining as I do totally different opinions from those which are esteemed orthodox by my Roman brethren, I am yet obliged to say that I deem it to be incredible—that I regard it as the wildest flight of the imagination—that the Orders of the Anglican Church and the Orders of the Roman Church should be one and the same Orders of Christ's instituting. If this were so, then did Christ institute two distinct and contradictory Orders of clergy: the one a sacerdotal, a sacrificial order, which was custodian of Mysteries, of Seven Sacraments; the other a ministerial and protesting Order, which was appointed to utterly obliterate Catholic priesthood, and to pass three whole centuries in vilifying it. No,

sir, common sense is my sufficient theologian for proving the non-identity of the two Orders. And common sense is my sufficient logician for demonstrating this simple, honest truth: that a Church which copies three-fourths of its ritual, as well as three-fourths of its doctrines, from a Church which it hates and cruelly slanders, is not made any more trustworthy by claiming what it has not, and by imitating what all its ancestors denounced. (Considerable sensation, with disturbance.)

I think, sir, I am warranted in my assertion that the Church of England cannot be said to exist; that there is no such thing on this earth as the Church of England; for that an institution should profess itself to be Divine, while all the world knows that it is the most human thing on earth, is an absurdity which is so gross and palpable as to be offensive. No one respects his Anglican friends more than I do. No one more admires the personal diligence of the Ritualists, or more appreciates their culture and their refinement. This, however, has nothing to do with the subject. I am asked to submit myself to the Establishment,

on the ground that it is not an Establishment but "The Church." My answer is that I positively decline to submit myself to "The Church" which is no Church in a teaching, Divine sense, whose origin was violence and fraud, whose history has been selfish and persecuting, and whose philosophy is a jumble of contradictions.

(The delegate resumed his seat amid the applause of the Dissenting party, but under tokens of disapproval from all the Anglicans. The President somewhat nervously looked at his watch, and then engaging in conversation with the other delegates, appeared to arrive at a conclusion which was welcome.)

The President. Perhaps as we have reached a certain point in the debate—though unhappily we have not approached to the solution for which we had all of us earnestly hoped, earnestly prayed—it may be as well if we take advantage of the pause to enjoy a little rest and fresh air. ("Hear, hear," and some amusement.) The next speaker who was to have addressed you was Captain Banner, an esteemed representative of the Salvation Army;

but he has unfortunately been obliged to absent himself for two hours, to "storm a citadel" in the neighborhood of St. Giles's (laughter); and I scarcely see how we can proceed further with advantage, unless he be present at our deliberations. He has, I believe, an important communication to make to us which should precede our further efforts after Reunion. I propose, therefore, that we separate till three o'clock; when we must hope that there will be additional light thrown upon our subject by the able speakers whom we shall have the pleasure of listening to. (Cheers, and *exeunt omnes.*)

LUNCHEON.

THERE was an obvious sense of relief among the multitude, when escaping from the cramped misery of Exeter Hall. Most of the wearied ones sought solace or invigoration in one of the many places of refreshment in the Strand; not a few even condescending to soothe their too depressed spirits at the bars of the ever-hospitable public-houses. The Editor of these pages crossed the road to "Simpson's Divan," the well-known dining-house opposite Exeter Hall; where he was rejoiced by meeting several old acquaintances, who, having just come out of the crush of British Protestantism, were bent upon the same object of restoration. Two clergymen and three laymen joined the Editor at a private table, where the boiled chicken and the Chablis might favor repose.

On coming out of Exeter Hall various vendors of light literature—chiefly of a more or less theological character—had sought pur-

chasers of such publications as the following: "A Form for the Admission of Papists into the Church of England," an "Annual Report of the Church Association," and some recent copies of various Church of England newspapers. The five friends of the Editor had liberally purchased such productions; and, while luncheon was being served, they carelessly turned over the pages of what might, or might not, prove to be amusing.

The Editor of these pages was busy looking at his short-hand notes; and for a few minutes was glad not to be interrupted. He was wondering anxiously whether he had made mistakes in his reporting, and was about to refer a few points to his friends, when one of them, Mr. Carruthers—who was a rising young barrister, and who was sitting just opposite to him at the luncheon table—began to laugh over the contents of his recent purchase. "Oh, I say, do listen to this," he pleaded; and so every one gave him the best attention. "Armytage," he continued—addressing one of the company who was just then deeply absorbed in a newspaper—"this is the very thing to in-

COLLEGE OAKLAND

terest *you;* for you are a convert to Rome; and this is the proper book for you to study—for the enlightenment of your wandering intelligence, and to bring you back into the paradise you have left. The title of this book is: 'A Form of Admitting Converts from the Church of Rome to the Church of England; and for Restoring those who have Relapsed; prepared by the Upper House of Convocation, A.D. 1714, and amended by the same, A.D. 1890. Price sixpence.' Now, my dear Armytage, I do not know whether you wish to be 'restored' to the Church of England"—("No, I do not," said Mr. Armytage)—"but supposing you should have that desire at a future day, it must interest you to know what you will have to swear to. The 'restored' one is informed in this pamphlet—I beg pardon, in this sacred ordinal of Convocation—that the Church of England is a true and sound part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church; and lest he should harbor a doubt on the subject, he is called on to affirm that he believes in 'the Supremacy of the Queen's Majesty by law established;' though whether that means that the Queen's

Majesty is established, or the Queen's Supremacy is established, or the Church of such Majestic Supremacy is established, the compilers have not been careful to define; but it is added that the Established Something, whatever it be, is declared in the 37th Article of Religion to be 'agreeable to the word of God;' a declaration which should be highly valuable to the converted soul. After this it appears that the bishop is to give an absolution from the frightful iniquity of having *not* believed in the Supremacy of the Queen's Majesty by law established; and so the penitent is received into the Royal Fold, into the parliamentary and by law established Church of England. It is not added how a convert ought to feel after this highly spiritual and Queen-reverencing performance; but there can be no doubt that he would immediately repair to Windsor Castle, prostrate himself at the feet of her Pontifical Majesty, and say penitently, 'Holy Mother, give me your blessing.'"

After this jest had been appreciated by the company, with lively comments and various suggestions for improvement, Mr. Middleton,

who was a brilliant Ritualistic clergyman, added his contribution to the entertainment. Mr. Middleton, who had only been one year in priest's orders, was obviously unsettled in his clerical mind in regard to his strained Anglican position; indeed he has since been received into the Roman Church, to which the consistency of his manly character naturally impelled him.

"That is a good joke you have read to us, Carruthers," said Mr. Middleton, "but I think I have got even a better. I too gave sixpence for the 'Annual Report of the Church Association,' and I really think it is worth the money. My eye catches this one passage, and I will read it to you; and I shall certainly write immediately to the publishers of your 'Form for Receiving Converts,' and propose that they interleave this passage in the 'Form.' 'Under the advice of its lawyers' "—and here Mr. Middleton proceeded to read from the Annual Report of the Church Association—"'the Council instituted a second suit, in order to bring before the House of Lords the evidence that *idolatrous worship had in fact been pub-*

licly paid before the graven images set up in St. Paul's Cathedral.' Now if you can beat that, Carruthers, for a good joke, I shall recommend you as a contributor to *Punch*. The comicality of accusing the amiable and accomplished clergymen who conduct the services in the Metropolitan Cathedral of Anglicanism of '*in fact* committing idolatry before graven images,' is only equalled by the sectarian pique which such an accusation must demonstrate, and by the sense of failure which such Protestant slanders must imply."

"Not bad," said Mr. Armytage, who was holding a newspaper in his hand, and who had glanced at it in the intervals of boiled chicken; "I think that you, Middleton, have made a valuable purchase—almost as valuable as the 'Form for Receiving Converts.' But I am now going to eclipse you both by *my* purchase; if you have souls, you wretched Protestants, to appreciate it. (Laughter.) I have bought a copy of the *Church Times*, and I can tell you that I always enjoy reading that newspaper, as a sort of study of the unutterable miseries of Outsideism."—"Gently, my dear Army-

tage," said Mr. Carruthers, "*you* have only been an 'Insider' for six months."—"Hold your tongue, Carruthers, and listen to me, and let me see if I can get to the bottom of your understanding. Now I always turn instinctively to the advertisements in religious papers; because I think they strike the key-note of its theology; for, whatever the editor may approve in leading-article doctrine, he cannot control the drolleries of his advertisers. So I am going to read to you bits of a dozen advertisements, taken out of the columns of the *Church Times*. The advertisements are all by Anglican clergymen, who are in want of cure of souls—or cure of preferment. Please attend, and mind you catch the meaning; because these things require to be read below the surface:

"'Priest wanted, E. P.;' E. P. standing for Eastward Position, and signifying that the 'priest' must be supposed to be saying Mass—which is the last new view of the Anglican Communion Service.

"'Assistant Priest wanted, E. P., Lights;' Lights meaning that there will be candles on

the communion table, in imitation of the Catholic symbolism of doctrine. 'Temporary Curate wanted, Mod. High Church;' Mod. standing for moderate, and meaning that the curate must try to restrain his transcendental dispositions, and to remember that, after all, he is a Protestant. 'Good Churchman' is another recommendation, which sounds rather equivocal, as suggesting that 'High' or 'Mod.' may not be quite up to the standard of 'Good.' 'Sound Churchman' is also another adjective in the same column; though I do not know whether Soundness is a slight advance upon Mod., or a little less developed than 'High.' 'Distinctly High' is another clergyman's recommendation, and this seems to denote a sufficient altitude. 'Priest, married, without family,' is careful to add that he is 'sound;' while 'Priest, Catholic, widower, alone,' stirs up mixed ideas of what he may be wanting. Another priest offers 'garden and tennis' in return for kind clerical services; another 'a good house, garden, pony and trap;' another wants 'trout fishing;' and another tries to invite clerical aid by the tempting inducement 'no children.' One

more priest says 'everything perfect;' and another says 'no drawback,' so that we may rather envy the summer prospects of the lucky applicants.

"Now what strikes me as so droll in these advertisements," continued Mr. Armytage, "is not the pleasing variety of religious doctrine—that is a matter of course in the Church of England—but the claim of the *Church Times* to represent the Catholic Church by advertisements of scores of Protestant clergymen, whose notions of Mod., Sound, High, Good, Distinctly High Churchmen might make any Catholic child laugh heartily."

"Well," said Mr. Langdale, another of the little company, and a clergyman of the free-and-easy school of believers, untrammelled by party or by prejudice: "*à propos* of your advertisements from the *Church Times*, I must tell you of an idea which I have entertained, and I should like to hear whether our friend Middleton will approve it. That idea is to make the editor of the *Church Times* the Responsible and Governing Head of the Church of England." (Much laughter; with the ap-

proval of Mr. Armytage, "The best solution I have heard hazarded of the existing imbroglio.") "I am quite serious," continued Mr. Langdale. "At the present moment the Church of England has no Head. It has a very big body, and very weak legs, but it is utterly deficient in a Head. Now the Editor of the *Church Times* is just the man. The Church of England, not possessing infallibility, that gift naturally devolves upon its newspapers; and the *Church Times*, enjoying Ritualist pre-eminence, it follows that the irksome duties of the *Ecclesia Docens* have to be performed by its thoroughly capable editor. He does perform them. He tells the Archbishop of Canterbury when he is 'shuffling;' he tells the Bishop of Worcester that 'one who can thus play with first principles and flatly contradict the Prayer-Book order, stands self-condemned. His conduct was inexcusable and ought not to pass without grave reprimand from the archbishops and bishops of the Province of Canterbury.' This reprimand, not being forthcoming from the archbishops and bishops, is very properly administered by the

REV. JAMES A. GRANT BEQUEST TO
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY, 1926

editor. With equal devotion to his own authority, the editor lectures Convocation as to the 'best thing it can do,' in regard to the duty of 'fasting before Communion;' and he also advises his subscribers to ignore a bishop's license in respect to the remarrying of divorced persons. In short, he is Pontifex Maximus. Now I don't like to see a man who has such great gifts as this editor thrown away upon a mere penny paper. Every week he lectures the Catholic Church, and the Anglican Church, and the Non-Conformists; tells the Catholic Church where it is 'unscriptural,' and Non-Conformists where they are 'schismatical,' and does his duty faithfully in defining dogmatic truth, and in rebuking the bishops, clergy, and laity who deserve it. Now this is evidently just the man the Establishment wants—a thoroughly competent Pontiff who lives in London. Why not put him over the Archbishop of Canterbury, over Convocation, over the Queen; and crown him with the triple diadem of the new Popedom? I hate to see a man wasted."

Here Mr. Middleton put in a plea, that he

thought "such an appointment would be invidious, because, as a matter of fact, every one of the daily newspapers, besides a good many of the weekly, claimed to be able to teach everybody everything. For example," continued Mr. Middleton, "I remember when the Archbishop of Canterbury gave his judicial opinion about Bishop King, the *Daily News* said in a leading article: 'The Archbishop, a respectable clergyman, against whose character no one has a word to say, and to whose opinion no one attaches the slightest importance, has been assisted by five prelates of more piety than discretion.' This is what you may call dethroning all Church of England authority, and re-enthroning it in the arm-chair of a single editor. Nor is there any one of the English newspapers, from the *Times* to the poor old *Rock*, that cannot define at a moment's notice what the Roman Church would take centuries to define; or that is not a whole Œcumenical Council in itself—not on one doctrine, but on every doctrine, as well as on all points of morals and of discipline. No, I must protest against selecting *one* editor for

Supreme Pontiff. My proposal would be this: that the editors of all the Church of England newspapers should meet once a year in solemn conclave; should feel the pulse of the nation as to what was most popular (in that particular year) in regard to each of the Articles of the Creeds; and should fix the national dogmatic truth for the next twelvemonth only—under pain of excommunication by all the editors."

"My dear Middleton," said Mr. Armytage, "before one week had passed, the *Rock* would excommunicate the *Church Times;* the *Daily News* would give such fearful penance to the *Morning Post*, that the whole of its staff and all its compositors would go into a consumption; while the *Times* would lay the whole Press under an interdict, or would summon all the editors to Printing House Square, and make an *auto da fé* of them on Tower Hill."

At this point, Mr. Trevor, who was a young Cambridge undergraduate, about nineteen, and who had not yet taken part in the conversation, burst forth with the spasmodic observation, "I shall start one more sect."—"Pray

don't," said all the company at once.—"I have a mathematical mind," continued Mr. Trevor. (And the smile that passed round the table did not seem to quench that amiable conviction.) "I like to see a principle carried out to its ultimate, to its natural, indeed inevitable superlative. Now I tell you what has long been my idea." (And the company thought that the "long" could not be very long.) "As a matter of fact—and of course I start with a postulate, as every good mathematician is bound to do—every Protestant is his own pontiff. This is a postulate which even Euclid would have backed. Every Protestant centres in his own person a perfect hierarchy, the dogmatic rights of the Teaching Church in all ages, an infallibility on all doctrines to which no pope ever laid claim, with a power of excommunicating all who differ from him. This being so, there is obviously room for one more new sect, which should be novel only in the perfect candor of its profession. Let this new sect maintain boldly: Every man who is born into this world is born a complete Catholic Church within himself, with full power to absolve, bind, dispense,

or excommunicate himself—but no one else; and thus there is no further reason of being for unpleasant remarks about our neighbors, for offensive Alliances, Leagues, Unions, or Associations, or, indeed, for ever mentioning the subject of religion to another person. This would save all difficulty and inconvenience, and would get rid of the perpetual breaches of amenity."

"What name do you propose to give to your new sect?" asked Mr. Armytage. "I think the name would be the only real difficulty."

"You see," said young Mr. Trevor, "the specialty of my new sect will be this, that every one will be a perfect sect within himself. Indeed he will be a perfect Church—Ecclesia Docens and Ecclesia Discens—so that no one can be heretical, can be schismatical, because every one will be an integral Catholic Church, and therefore can only be a Dissenter from his own self, a heretic from his own personal infallibility. You catch the sublimity of my conception—the all-embracing incarnation of my Catholicity? Well, now as to the name of the New Religion—not new, for it is at least as old as

Protestantism, but no one has had the courage to give it form—I have thought that the sect of the Egotistic Catholics might do; or shall we say the Impersonated Final Appealists; or the Individual Infallibilists; or—but now I think of it, the sect would not have any name, because there would not be, in reality, any sect. When a man said he was Mr. Jones, he would say he was the whole Catholic Church; and so of Mr. Smith, Mr. Brown. I think it would make the world perfectly delightful, if every time you met a man in the street you felt you were shaking hands with the Catholic Church. As a matter of fact you feel this now. But the sublimity of my conception is in the *profession* of a principle, which hitherto has been only experimented *sub rosa*. 'How are you, Catholic Church?' would be such a charming salutation, as you walked down the Strand or Pall Mall; and whether it were——"

But at this point a familiar friend saluted Mr. Trevor, and inquired "when he was going in for his Little-go," so that the rest of the fine conception was lost.

And the company, now rising from luncheon,

went for a stroll down the Strand. The Broad Church Delegate was met on the way, arm in arm with the somewhat didactic Wesleyan Delegate, and both were evidently enjoying a merry chat. Stopping to look into the window of a picture dealer, where were portraits of some eminent Ritualist clergymen, robed in the latest fashions of Anglican ritual, the five friends were diverted by noticing the Rev. Sebastian Stole engaged in the same worshipful admiration. He was quite lost in the artistic study of Catholicity. A portrait of the Bishop of Lincoln depicted that prelate in what appeared to be an abnormally large chasuble; while he was made to carry a pastoral staff, and to look very uncomfortable, like a person who had borrowed strange clothes. Mr. Armytage could not help the remark: "Date that portrait 1840, instead of 1890, and what would Londoners have thought of it—fifty years ago? Why, there would have been a commission *de lunatico inquirendo*, and the bishop would have been confined during Her Majesty's pleasure!" The Rev. Sebastian Stole, who was gazing on the same picture, appeared to over-

hear the observation, and moved away from such pestilent society.

But as it now wanted only ten minutes to three, the friends felt the call of stern duty, and went back to the Sanctuary of Opinions.

THE AFTERNOON.

It was evident that a new element had been imported into the hall; the beautiful Irish brogue gently undulating among the crowd, like a suggestion of music to British ears. Only a few of the morning audience had come back for the Second Act; while not half of the new-comers were English. Scarcely had the first speaker commenced his oration, when some critics from the keenly judicial "sister-isle" offered him suggestions or emendations.

The President, having called on the Salvationist Delegate to speak on behalf of the Salvationists, that gentleman responded with avidity to the invitation, as though he were eager to unburden himself of a responsibility.

The Salvationist Delegate (addressing the President). Sir, my proposal is simply this: that the whole of the Church of England should at once join the Salvation Army, and so be-

come absorbed into the True Religion. (Loud laughter.) You seek for Reunion. Well, the only really united body of Non-Conformists in England is the body which I have the honor to represent; then why should not the Church of England abandon its isolation, which cuts it off from the best life of the English masses, and so at one and the same time acquire earnestness for its members, and enhance the sphere of the Army's labors and victories? I hold in my hand a little book which is called "The Doctrines of the Salvation Army;" and I doubt whether there are half a dozen members of the Establishment who would not approve of these doctrines. When I add that these doctrines are "prepared for the Training Homes by the General," and are thus authorized by the highest authority in the world, I am persuaded that I shall have no difficulty in enlisting every one of you under the standard of the great arch-priest of Salvationism.

The Ritualist Delegate. I am sorry to interrupt you, sir, but you have said that you "doubt whether there are half a dozen members of the Establishment who would not ap-

prove of the doctrines in that book." Now, I have read that book through more than once, and I cannot find in it the faintest allusion—no, not so much even as by name—to the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion. May I ask how you explain this strange silence?

The Salvationist Delegate. The Army does not insist on Sacramental religion; it insists only on spiritual change of heart; and, if I mistake not, the great majority of Church of Englandists are of one mind with the Army in that regard.

The Ritualist Delegate. Pardon me. The point is that your General sets forth in this doctrinal work the *whole* substance of the Christian faith and obligation. No sacrament is included in that faith, and no sacrament is included in that obligation. Now Queen Elizabeth swept away five sacraments out of seven; and this might be regarded as a sufficiently free exercise of the Pontifical Sovereignty of a vain woman. But *your* Pontiff, General Booth, goes much further. He actually eliminates all sacraments from the Christian religion. You, sir, may consider General Booth to be "the

highest authority in the world;" but I consider him to be no authority at all. "Who sent you?" would be a question he could not answer. And therefore as you propose to us that we should become "absorbed" into Salvationism, I am justified in saying plainly that, as you have no Orders and no Sacraments, and no authority, but what I may call a Herculean Egotism, the Anglo-Catholics could not for a moment think of being absorbed into a society which is at the best only apologetic or spasmodic. Profoundly as I admire the sterling philanthropy of the Army, and the grand aid which it has given to the temperance movement, to call the Army a substitute for the Catholic Church, or even so much as an auxiliary to Catholic authority, would be grotesque to the very verge of profanity.

The Salvationist Delegate. I am afraid, sir, I must reply to you by a *tu quoque*. It is far better to be in earnest about a good life, and to try to make others in earnest also, than to affect to believe in authority while disobeying it; to insist on a Catholic priesthood in a Protestant Church which has spent three centuries

in vilifying the Catholic priesthood; and to ape a character, a faith, and a ritual, which belong only to the Church from which you have stolen them; and which both that Church and your own Church refuse to recognize as being anything better than a make-believe. (Laughter and cheering.)

The President. We are wandering from the subject. Is there any plan, sir, (and here the President addressed the Salvationist Delegate) which you have it in your power to propose, by which the Salvation Army can be brought into union with the Church of England?

The Salvationist Delegate. None, sir, but this: that the Church of England should make up its mind what it does believe, and give some assurance that it will continue in the same mind for twelve months; and then the Salvation Army will take into its consideration whether it should admit the Church into corporate union with itself, subject to the conditions which it imposes on its members of absolute obedience to authority.

The President. And who is to be the Ultimate Authority in matters of faith?

(A voice from the crowd: "His Holiness Pope Booth the First.")

The Salvationist Delegate (not heeding the interruption). We have no Ultimate Appeal but the Scriptures.

The President. That is the assertion of rather more than two hundred sects. But I am sure you must agree with me that if the Church of England should submit corporately to the doctrinal rule of the Salvation Army, the twenty millions of seceding Anglicans would wish to know whether they were exchanging a weak authority for one which could show credentials of being stronger. Will you kindly tell us, then, who is your Ultimate Appeal?

(The Salvationist Delegate seeming unwilling to reply, a good deal of irreverent remark escaped the crowd. The Wesleyan Delegate, however, came to the rescue, by saying:) "We can hardly expect a Salvationist to answer a question which a Ritualist is incompetent to answer." This sally, which was received with some merriment, brought the Ritualist Delegate to his feet, who remarked: "The question

as to Ultimate Appeal—for Dissenters as much as for Anglicans—is one which can admit of no answer, until such time as the whole of Christendom shall be reunited in one faith, and a General Council shall represent the Catholic Church." To which response the Wesleyan Delegate rejoined: "Permit me, sir, to critically examine that statement—that is, if our friend the Salvationist Delegate will kindly allow me to arrest his speech for a few moments." The Salvationist Delegate having bowed his acquiescence, the Wesleyan Delegate proceeded: "Because Christendom, to your thinking, is now schismatical, it follows, you assert, that until the schism first be healed there can be no authority which can determine what is schism! To what a dead-lock have you brought your Catholicity! There is schism, you say, because there is no Authority; yet out of this schism you will re-beget your Authority! There was once, you say, Catholic Authority, but it died, and the reason why it died was because certain wicked men rebelled against that Catholic Authority! So the Catholic Authority was punished—nay, was ren-

dered extinct upon the earth—by the wickedness of the rebels, who resisted it; not the rebels but the Authority being annihilated by the just anger of Divine Providence—against the rebels! To what a pass has your profound logic brought your Ritualism, or rather has your profound Ritualism brought your logic! Euclid himself might have envied you the 'which is absurd' by which you have rendered Christian truth an impossibility. Sir, if you are sincere in your first principles—and I do not for one moment doubt your sincerity—why do you not hasten to set a good example, by submitting at once to that only Authority in Christendom which *claims* the power to summon a General Council for the purpose of defining articles of the faith; and which *claims* the power to extinguish heresy within the Church by putting all wilful heretics outside it?"

(This retort seemed to so delight the Irish element that constant cheering was kept up for a minute or two. When the cheering had subsided, the President remarked placidly): Unless the Ritualist Delegate feels called on

to reply, we should like to listen to some practical proposal from the Salvationist. Up to the present moment we have been rather negative than positive; whereas the sole object of this Council should be positive.

The Ritualist Delegate. I have only to repeat, sir, in reply to the suggestion of the Wesleyan Delegate, as to the *claim* of the Roman Church to summon Councils, and as to my inferred duty of submitting to that Roman claim, that no Council could now be Œcumenical unless it included the Anglican and Greek Churches—two of the three branches of the Catholic Church.

The Wesleyan Delegate (addressing the Salvationist Delegate). Have I your permission, sir, to reply?

(Loud shouts of "Reply, Reply," coming from the Irish party in the hall, the Salvationist could not withhold his permission.)

The Wesleyan Delegate. A few moments, sir, will suffice for my rejoinder. The Ritualist Delegate says there are three Branch Churches—the Anglican, the Greek, and the Roman. Now I must first ask the reverend

gentleman, Does he accept the first five General Councils?

The Ritualist Delegate. Yes.

The Wesleyan Delegate. Then I think I know how to reply to you. The First General Council, that of Nicæa, A.D. 325, was held under the authority of Pope Sylvester the First. The Second General Council, that of Constantinople, A.D. 381, was confirmed by the authority of Pope Damasus the First. The Third General Council, that of Ephesus, A.D. 431, was authorized by Pope Celestine the First. The Fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, was presided over by the delegate of Pope Leo the Great. The Fifth General Council, A.D. 553, that of the Second of Constantinople, was accounted Œcumenical on the sole ground that the Roman Pontiff gave his sanction to its doctrinal decrees. May I ask then, does the Ritualist Delegate grant the œcumenicity of these Councils, on the ground that the Roman Pontiffs approved them?

The Ritualist Delegate. Not "on the ground;" though I accept the historic fact.

The Wesleyan Delegate. I am speaking of historic facts, for the sole reason that I wish to demonstrate that your Ritualistic theory is untenable. At the time that these five Councils were held, there were "Branch Churches" just as there are at this day. When the First Council was held, there was the Branch Church of the Arians—a fairly big Branch Church, as we all know—and the Council excommunicated that Branch Church. When the Second Council was held there was the Branch Church of the Macedonians; and the Council excommunicated that Branch Church. When the Third Council was held, there was the Branch Church of the Nestorians; and the Council excommunicated that Branch Church. When the Fourth Council was held, there was the Branch Church of the Eutychians; and the Council excommunicated that Branch Church. When the Fifth Council was held, there was the Branch Church of the Revived Nestorians; and the Council excommunicated that Branch Church. I am afraid, sir, that your theory of Branch Churches would not have found favor with the first five General Councils—whose supreme

authority you are disposed to recognize as being Divine.

(The Ritualist Delegate, seeming to be wearied with the controversy, merely remarked: "Ingenious, but unreal." And the President, catching the eye of the Salvationist Delegate, notified to him that he should continue his address.)

The Salvationist Delegate. De la Rochefoucauld has observed that "in the misfortunes of even our best of friends there is a something which does not displease us;" and I own to having enjoyed the retort of the Wesleyan Delegate, though its satire was a little severe on the Branch Theorists. For myself, I will only add that, as to the question of Final Appeal—on which both my Ritualist friend and myself have been catechised—that question has been in abeyance in this country since the time of the Elizabethan Reformation; and I do not feel ashamed of being unable to reply, logically, to a question which was first revived by the Tractarians. My own position as a Salvationist is at least not more illogical than is that of the new Ritualists in the Church of

England. I own I do not see why a Salvationist should be made to blush for taking General Booth as his Supreme Arbiter, since no Ritualist thinks of blushing for taking *himself* as his Supreme Arbiter over Rome, Moscow, Canterbury, and all the sects. (Cheers and laughter.)

(The Salvationist Delegate having resumed his seat, the Delegate for the Home-Made Sects and the Delegate for the Imported Sects rose together; and this gave rise to frivolous comments among the audience, which it would be unfitting to transfer to this Report. The President, however, made a sign to the Home-Made Delegate, who plunged with a gay readiness into his advocacy, like a man who had something to say and meant to say it.)

The Delegate for the Home-Made Sects. There are bonds of sympathy between Anglicans and Non-Conformists which should unite them in the closest possible fellowship. To begin with, they both came into existence under Queen Elizabeth, and both were made the slaves of her caprice. Both were cruelly wronged by that monarch; Anglicans, in be-

ing *created* by her vanity; and Non-Conformists in being *crushed* by her tyranny. Now let me dwell for a few moments on the wrongs of Non-Conformists, on Queen Elizabeth's fiendish treatment of them for thirty years; and let me do this, not in a temper of unforgiveness, but because I want to show you why the very idea of a State Church must be abhorrent to the English Dissenting sensibility.

Carry your minds back to the sixteenth century, when the Congregationalists first gave martyrs to their faith. It was about the year 1580 when Mr. Robert Brown—who founded the devout sect of the Brownists—fought and suffered for the freedom of the Christian soul. In his day, the day of "Good Queen Bess"—though where her "goodness" was made apparent I have not discovered—every Non-Conformist was fined twenty pounds for refusing to attend the Church of England service; and was ordered to find sureties to the value of two hundred pounds, until such time as he should conform to the Established Church. If he persisted in attending a service in any conventicle, he was imprisoned until he should give

signs of repentance. If he remained obstinate he was banished the kingdom; and if he returned, he was hanged. Among the hosts of the sect of the Brownists who were so persecuted, one Roger Rippon expired a prisoner in Newgate; and on his coffin was placed this bitter inscription: "This is the corpse of Roger Rippon, a servant of Christ, and Her Majesty's faithful subject, who is the last of sixteen or seventeen whom that great enemy of God the Archbishop of Canterbury, with his High Commission, have murdered in Newgate within five years." I need not recall to you the names of Barrowe, Greenwood, and Penry, who were butchered for presuming to reject the Queen's religion; or for refusing to show respect to her Apostolical Succession—which she afterward admitted to be no Succession at all. Nor was there a prison in London—Newgate, Bridewell, the Fleet, the Marshalsea, the Counter, the Clink, the Gatehouse, the White Lion—which was not crowded with English Dissenters of good repute; many years being allowed to pass before these sufferers were emancipated, and three of them, under the 23d Statute of Queen

Elizabeth, being dragged to Tyburn to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, as a homage to the self-created divinity of the "good" Queen. These were the days, gentlemen, of "the birth of liberty of conscience!" These were the days when "civil and religious freedom" took the place of the dogmatic ruling of the Church of Rome! Truly the Court of High Commission surpassed in its malignity and its atrocity all that we hear fabled of the worst horrors of the Inquisition; for the Inquisition dealt only with sacrilege and apostasy, or with crimes which cloaked rebellion against governments; whereas the Court of High Commission punished Dissent as if it were parricide, and this too with the consent of ecclesiastics.

Now why do I recall these terrors to your attention? Because I want to show you that Non-Conformists, like Anglicans, have ever been the victims of royal tyranny, the difference being, as I have said, that Anglicanism was *created*, while Non-Conformism was *crushed*, by royal spitefulness, vanity, and immorality. Just as Henry VIII. compelled his subjects to abjure the supremacy of the Pope, yet com-

pelled them to remain faithful to all Roman doctrines, so did Queen Elizabeth compel her subjects to acknowledge the Divinity of her own Pontificate, while compelling them to accept an Episcopate of her own creation; equally persecuting those Anglicans who inclined toward the Old Religion, and those Dissenters who ventured to recoil from the New. It is needless to follow the sad story through Stuart times; to speak of Edward Wightman, the Baptist, who was burned for his heresy by King James the First; just as two Baptists had been burned at Smithfield by Queen Elizabeth for declining the honor of belonging to her State Church. You remember that even the Act of Toleration, A.D. 1689, only permitted Dissenters to enjoy their civil rights on the condition that they swore to believe in the Thirty-nine Articles; nor was this Act repealed until 1779; and you are aware that it is only quite recently that all Test Acts and Uniformity Acts have been swept away from the anti-Christian English Statute Book. I say to you, then, my Anglican friends, that there should be this bond of sympathy between us—

between all Establishmentarians and all Dissenters—that Anglicans suffered the wrong and the humiliation of having a Church *made for them* by Henry's daughter, with the aid of a revolutionary and abandoned clique; while Dissenters suffered the wrong and the humiliation of being *tortured* by that same unscrupulous woman, because they would not accept her extemporized substitute for Christianity. (Murmurs and applause.)

And here I cannot help observing—to refer for a moment to modern times—that it is to the Anglican House of Lords that all Dissenters are indebted for the most bigoted and most malignant persecution. It was the Lords who maintained the Test and Corporation Acts; who refused, in 1834, to repeal an Act which forbade twenty Dissenters to worship together without a license from a Bishop of the Church of England; who, in 1839, refused an Education Grant because Dissenters would be gainers by the bounty; who five times rejected Bills for abolishing the Church Rate; who three times rejected Bills which gave Dissenters the consolation of the presence of

their own ministers at their friends' graves; and who four times rejected Bills for the abolition of those tests which deprived Dissenters of all prizes at the Universities. Well might Mr. Chamberlain say, at Denbigh, in his "Plain Words to Peers" (1884), "The cup of the House of Lords is nearly full."

The President. I fully recognize your personal right to express these sentiments, but I would rather that you gave your reasons for either resisting or acceding to the proposal for the Reunion of the Churches.

The Delegate for the Home-Made Sects. I regret that I have to affirm that it would be impossible that Non-Conformists should make their submission to the State Church, and for reasons which I will now briefly state. The "bonds of sympathy" I have referred to should lead us to live in harmony, to abjure every expression of hostility, and to strive our mutual utmost to emancipate all Christians from the tyranny of Kings, Parliaments, or State Clergy. But as to Reunion—ah, that is another question, and I will now give the reasons why it cannot be. The first reason is that there are at least

three big Churches within the Church which is best known as the Establishment; besides several scores of very little Churches. (Laughter.)

Suppose that all Dissenters were to submit to-morrow to the Establishment, each one of them would have to be asked this pertinent question: "To which Church of the Establishment are you submitting—to the Ritualist, the Broad Church, or the Evangelical?" (Renewed laughter.) I own I do not see how any Dissenter in all the world, however elastic or comprehensive his capacity, could be able to become all three at once. (A voice, "He might alternate them, week by week.") In Japan there is a temple called "The Temple of the Ten Thousand Idols;" and a devotee may well pay his respects to the whole number, because the divinities are only powers, they are not teachers; nor is it said that each of the gods has a different religion; so that the respect which the devotee pays to the ten thousand divinities need not necessarily imply a belief in ten thousand creeds. But in the Church of England if there were a temple of all the idols of Private

Judgment in the sense of the homage which each man pays to his own opinion, the innumerable idols would require a "Catalogue" even more lengthy and voluminous than that of the Library of our National Museum in great Russell Street. (Some amusement.)

But now I will suppose, first, that a Dissenter submits to the Ritualist party—or rather that he does *not* submit, for to submit would be an impossible absurdity, but that he is invited by the Ritualist party to become a Ritualist. He would find it painful to be obliged to reply as follows:

"You, the Ritualists, say that you are the Primitive Catholic Church, and that you have only gone back to a thousand years before Luther. You ignore all the reformers, with Queen Elizabeth, and also the whole of the last three centuries of English Protestantism; and, leaping over the mighty chasm of fifteen centuries, you assure us that you are the resuscitated Early Church. Well, in this case you have to confess that, for the last three centuries, your Church has been no Church at all. It has blasphemed doctrines which you now affirm to

be primitive; omitted sacraments which you now declare to be essential; and practised a ritual which you now say is anti-Catholic; and so you have to confess yourselves the offspring of apostates, who have disgraced this country and your Catholic religion for three centuries. A word more, and I will leave you to your conscience. You have demonstrated, by your utter failure to be truly Catholic—substituting your self-will for obedience, your fancy doctrines for submission to your Bishop—that you are a pretence, not the real Catholic Church; indeed you have brought Church authority into contempt, by centring it in your individual caprice. You are not 'The Church,' but a sect, just like we are; you are Dissenters from your own communion, from your own ancestry; your new Ritualism being as much a matter of self-creation as is our Independentism, Quakerism, or Baptistism."

So much for the Ritualist invitation. But now the Broad Churchman will take up the cudgels—or rather the sweet olive-branch of Reunion—and will beg the Dissenter to join *his* party. The Dissenter, I should imagine,

would reply as follows: "A Broad Churchman is no Churchman at all. He is very often not even a Christian. The severest attacks on the Christian citadel have come from Broad Churchmen; Canons and Deans, reverend Professors and College Dons, have sown the seeds of infidelity by their speculations; while Bampton lecturers, Doctors of Divinity, and popular preachers have dealt more tenderly with Agnosticism or Free-thinking than they have with Christian doctrines or divine faith. Only a few days ago the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol presented a petition to Convocation, in which it was pleaded: 'It is generally known that certain clergymen of the Church of England, in positions of influence and authority, are deliberately undermining, by their teachings and public writings, the faith of the Church in this country in the trustworthiness of the Holy Scriptures, and are also repudiating the common faith of Christendom.' The truth is that what is called Modern Thought has found its best allies in Broad Churchmen; whereas the Divinity of Christ has been insisted upon by *all* Dissenters (Great cheering from all

the parties in the hall) save of course by the Socinians or Unitarians. A Broad Churchman is such a nondescript professor! He is a man who will affect scientism—or what he considers to be scientism—with a calm and a speculative estimate of things in general, together with an amiable impression that Christianity is a good religion, provided you care more for its morals than for its doctrines. He is, perhaps, a Freethinker first, and a Christian afterward, though education and the national sentiment preserve his 'faith.' Forty years ago he was an easy-thinking Christian who objected only to Roman Catholicism and to unbelief; to-day he will include both extremes in his forgiveness provided there be no aggressiveness, no earnestness. I do not know a more dangerous man than your Broad Churchman. He will dabble in Biblical criticism, with its ally, 'scientific infidelity'—a conjunction of words which suggests 'rational imbecility' or 'intelligent idiocy,' or any other odd compound of contradictories—nor will he refuse his fellowship to any theorist, provided he has only opinions, no convictions, and looks on *credo* and *nego* as the

same thing. No, my impression is that a Dissenter would rather be anything than a Broad Churchman. I believe he would rather be a Ritualist." (Laughter.)

But will not the Evangelical party be more successful? Unquestionably we would all join the Evangelical party to-morrow, if they would renounce their pagan slavery to the British Parliament. (Partial cheering.) Evangelicals are only accidentally Anglican, they are essentially Non-Conformist in their sentiments. They care no more for state theology than did John Wesley.—And here I may be permitted to make a digression, in regard to that great reformer, John Wesley. I could not help thinking, when the Wesleyan Delegate was addressing you, how immeasurable was the service which John Wesley rendered to the Establishment; more even when he left it than when he belonged to it. He killed Erastianism, as much as Newman killed Puritanism. John Wesley made dry bones to live; and *you*, sir, (here the speaker turned to the Ritualist Delegate) would never have found a party in the Church of England sufficiently earnest to in-

quire anxiously about Christian *doctrines*, had not John Wesley first revived the Christian *sentiment;* without which doctrines are only as ribs over a still heart. It was Wesley who——

The Ritualist Delegate. With every respect for the personal character of John Wesley, there can be no question that he was guilty of the sin of schism.

The Delegate for the Home-Made Sects. The sin of schism! How can an Anglican talk of the sin of schism? Or how could John Wesley be a schismatist from a Communion whose very origin and reason of being was Royal Schism? Sir, every Dissenter feels that the Church of England can have no right to charge with the sin of schism any person or number of persons who desert it. I think I can make this plain to you in two minutes. A few days ago I was conversing with a Roman Catholic; and I read to him a passage from a Church newspaper, in which Roman Catholics were charged with the sin of schism. My Catholic friend laughed merrily; and I believe I can verbally remember his answer. That answer is as good for all Dissenters as it is for the Catholic body in this

country. "If the Church of Elizabeth," said my Catholic friend, "in the sixteenth century, had the moral right and the ecclesiastical power, first, to repudiate the supremacy of the Holy See; next, to repudiate all Church communion with Roman Catholics; next, to persecute with the rack and with the gibbet those who remained faithful to the Old Religion, as well as those who invented new religions for themselves; next, to obliterate five sacraments out of seven, and then to reduce the 'two only' to 'open questions;' next, to do away with the sacrifice of the Mass, and to substitute a form of prayer read to the people—going so far even as to place the consecrated altar-stones at the church door, that they might be trodden upon in uttermost contempt for their signification; next, to have monthly, or three-monthly, 'celebrations of the Lord's Supper,' in place of the daily consuming of the Adorable Host at a thousand altars; next, to do away with the monastic and conventual life, while utterly repudiating the virginity of ecclesiastics; next, to substitute a private interpretation of the Scriptures for the authoritative and dogmatic

ruling of Church authority; next, to get rid of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to make Prime Ministers the sources of spiritual power —*ex plenitudine Apostolicæ potestatis*—if the Church Establishment could do all these things, and a great many more, without incurring the deadly sin of schism, then what can be more ridiculous than to charge Catholics with schism for adhering firmly to the very letter of the Old Faith; or to charge Dissenters with schism for preferring the ideas of good men to those of a murderous king or a fickle woman?" I own that I felt the reasonableness of that argument. To talk of schism from the biggest of all Schisms, or of separation from the biggest of all Separatists, did appear to me fantastic and childish. And I imagine, gentlemen, that you, most of you, think so too. (A good deal of smiling and obvious amusement followed this question, but no one thought it worth while to object.) The Church of England, full of faults as it has been, has at least rendered this boon to all Anglicans: that it has made the commission of the sin of schism an impossibility—that is, consistently with its

own principles. As to heresy, well, that has gone in the same way. Unless a man should persist in disobeying himself, I do not see how he can possibly be a heretic—that is, according to the philosophy of the Church of England; which, as my friend the Wesleyan Delegate has remarked, is not the philosophy of a "Church," but the jumble of contradictions in an "Institution."

I have been asked if I will submit to that "Institution;" to what Lord Houghton called "that branch of the Civil Service called the Church of England." And my reply is, I must respectfully say, no. First, gentlemen, get rid of your "Civil Service;" then get rid of your Ritualism and your Broad Churchism; and with the Evangelical party I shall be most happy to ally myself, reverencing them fraternally and sympathetically.

(The audience had scarcely time to express their sentiments when the Ritualist Delegate claimed their attention, as though in response to the speech he had just heard.)

The Ritualist Delegate. I waive all consid-

eration of the question of schism, on which it is unlikely that we should agree; but I maintain that it is to the Ritualists, and to the Ritualists alone, that the Church of England is indebted for its vitality. (Cheers.) I have had to put up with a good deal of incrimination, and I think I may say a plain word for myself. ("Hear, hear.")

At the beginning of this century, so general was the lassitude which pervaded both the clergy and the laity, that the Church of England could only be described as being fast asleep, wrapped in the profoundest slumber of oblivion. I cannot conceive of anything less suggestive of Christianity than a Church of England parish church—even fifty years ago. I well remember it. Indeed my father was an old-fashioned country parson. Three boxes in every church, piled one above another, obscured even so much as a glimpse of the altar. The clergy drawled; the clerk moaned; the people slept; and the whole thing was such a dreary, dismal bore that any conventicle in the kingdom would have been preferable. "A funeral service over a defunct religion" was the sug-

gestion to any foreigner, to any Catholic. Let me quote to you Dean Gregory, the present Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, on the dead-and-alive state of the Church in 1820. The Dean says: "Pluralites among the clergy were almost universal. . . . Benefices were looked upon as estates. . . . So late as 1820 a Bishopric and a Deanery of St. Paul's were held together; the rich pluralist giving his sons canonries and several livings in different parts of the country. . . . The sick and the dying were uncared for; the poor were unvisited; the children were untaught; the most solemn services of the Church were so negligently performed as to be productive of evil rather than good." And again, says Dean Gregory: "In some country churches the Squire's seat was fitted up as a parlor with a table and chairs and a fireplace, and with curtains to hide the occupants from the view of the rest of the congregation. Nor were the services more attractive. There was no chanting, hymns were unknown. The week-day services in cathedrals were compulsorily maintained, but the choirs and clergy attended so irregularly and behaved so irrever-

ently as effectually to keep worshippers away. There were few churches in which Holy Communion was celebrated more frequently than once a month."

Such was the state of things up to the time of the Oxford Movement. And why is it that the Church of England is now alive, instead of being dead, to all practical intents and purposes? I maintain that it is solely because the doctrines of the High Church party have vivified the moribund life of the whole nation; and that whereas Broad Churchmen have gone to sleep, and Evangelicals have talked sentiment, the High Church party *alone* have borne the burden and heat of the day; and, spite of prejudice, of abuse, of ignorant obstruction, have brought back the Church of England to its first love; to Catholic vigor, Catholic belief, Catholic intensity; to the living for the next world rather than for this. (Immense cheering.) I consider it to be ungrateful to the High Church party to ignore their valuable services to religion, as well as to society and to the whole country; and I fling back the sneers of all Low Churchmen, be they Angli-

cans, Dissenters, or Nothingarians, as unworthy of men who have *not* worked as we have, have *not* reaped the fruit of their perseverance. (Renewed cheering; which was apparently taken up by all parties; the Dissenters as much as the Anglicans fully recognizing the sincerity as well as the manifest truth of this pleading.)

The Broad Church Delegate. I am disposed to indorse what the Ritualist Delegate has just said, though it be to the disparagement of my own party. (Cheers and laughter.) And now I have to break a lance on my own account with the doubtless conscientious Delegate from the Home-Made Sects. That gentleman has talked sarcastically of the "big divisions" in the Establishment, just as though there were no divisions among Dissenters! Come, sir, you know a good deal better than that. (Laughter.) Why, I remember, at the last Congress at Rhyl, the Rector of Llandudno, a Welsh clergyman of experience, asserted: "I do not believe that the leading Non-Conformist bodies are drawing nearer to one another, except so

far as closer association is helpful to sentiments which would be hostile to the Church." And I remember too that the Rev. D. Williams, a High Churchman, thus expressed himself in regard to Non-Conformity: "Its myriad inconsistencies, its insane hatreds, its audacious claims, and its persistent charge of alienhood against the Church, are reducible to this one struggle: to be state-recognized and state-established, to be more in union with the state, to get the upper hand here and the upper hand there, and the upper hand everywhere; state-paid schools, state-paid colleges—soon it will be state-paid chapels. This is the neck or nothing of Dissent." I also recall a speech of a Baptist minister, made at a public conference last year, in which he said: "The various sections of Non-Conformists act toward each other like dogs fighting over a bone," a confession upon which the Anglican *Church Times* made this comment: "The unanimity of the sects is a sham; it is a thin veneer of friendship fastened to a solid block of envy." Well, all this does not look much like Reunion; nor does it justify my esteemed friend, the Delegate for

COLLEGE

the Home-Made Sects, in throwing stones at the glass house of Broad Churchism. (Upon which the Broad Church Delegate abruptly sat down, and the audience gave him mixed cheers and hisses.)

The Delegate for the Imported Sects (being now called upon by the President, moved forward to the front of the platform, and, putting his hands behind him, said slowly and with grief). To what purpose has all this controversy tended? I am weary of it. I had hoped that *some* ground would have been taken, on which we could have all made a firm stand; and though I shall be the first, I hope I shall not be the last, to state what is that ground, and to abide by it.

I feel ashamed that we should meet here to-day with any other object in view than that of resistance to the apostate Church of Rome. (Cries of "Oh, oh," and derisive laughter.) When I think of those mighty giants of the Christian Church, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Melancthon; with the saintly Fathers of Augsburg and Geneva, of whom I may say that they were

the first apostles of those sects which you are pleased, perhaps derisively, to call "Imported,"—I blush for the timid, time-serving tone of argument which has thus far distinguished this Council. Recall the ardent controversies between Luther, Carlstadt, and the Popish Eck; and then think with humility on the milk-and-water conversation which has passed to-day for a protest against Rome. (Great laughter.) The saintly Fathers of Protestantism might be disunited in their opinions in regard to this or that dogma of man's insistence; but they were all unanimous in their opposition to Rome—that mother and mistress of abominations. (Great uproar, the Irish party shouting lustily and giving utterance to contemptuous observations.) I am not to be disturbed by Popish recusants, and shall calmly pursue the tenor of my argument.

The President. I think, sir, you should moderate your reprehension. Our object is the Reunion of all the Churches. Mere acrimony or vituperation, on your part, will hardly contribute to that beneficent result.

The Delegate for the Imported Sects. I agree

with you, sir, that our object is Reunion—but Reunion in *what?* Is it to be Reunion in backsliding, in a cowardly indifference to first principles; or is it to be Reunion under one common Christian standard: that of opposing what is Popish and false, and of defending what is Scriptural and sound? Sir, I maintain that there are only two standards in polemics: the one, the standard of "Christ, All in All;" the other, the standard of "Rome, All in All." (A voice: "There is a third standard: Yourself, All in All.") I fight under the standard of "Christ, All in All." I will never be a party to human religions. (A voice: "Unless it be the religion of Number One.") I fight under the banner of the great Reformers, who proclaimed the Gospel truth that to make war on the Man of Sin was to make war on behalf of the Redeemer. (A voice: "Who is your friend, the Man of Sin?" And the Delegate, turning sharply on his interlocutor, answered:) The Man of Sin is the Roman Catholic Pope, who seats himself in the temple of God, showing himself to be God.

(Here an Irishman rose in the centre of the

hall and said very quietly, and as though compassionating the Delegate: "Mr. President, is it permitted in this Council, that a gentleman, who is evidently far from well, should occupy our time with childish chatter about the Pope, or with fatuous abuse of the Catholic faith?" Before, however, the President could reply, the Delegate retorted with some vehemence:) I insist upon my right to proclaim the truth; to discharge my solemn duty of warning this grave Council against the insidious plots of Jesuits and Ritualists. I have memorialized Her Majesty, our stanch Protestant Queen, and have implored her to issue a Royal Commission of Inquiry into Romanist and Ritualist tricks and conspiracies. Her Majesty is Defender of the Faith. (A voice, "*Which* faith?") Defender of the Protestant faith. (A voice, "*Which* Protestant faith?") Defender of the Augsburg Protestant faith, for which Martin Luther fought. (A voice, "In order that he might make a nun break her vows, and then marry her.")

The President. All this is beside the question. It is not only irrelevant, it is unseemly.

If the Delegate for the Imported Sects desire to insist on the truism that Her Majesty is Defender of the Faith, I shall not for a moment think of disturbing him; but he must do this without personal reflections, and he must limit himself to the question, "Can her Majesty, as Defender of the Faith, help to bring about the Reunion of the Churches?"

The Delegate for the Imported Sects. Unquestionably, sir, her Majesty, who is Defender of the Faith, can help to bring about the Reunion of the Churches.

The Irishman (who had previously addressed the President). Will the gentleman kindly define for us, so as to assist us in understanding his position, in what sense he speaks of her Majesty as being "Defender of *the* Faith"—using the definite, not the indefinite article?

The Delegate. Her Majesty is Defender of the Protestant Faith.

The Irishman. Then, sir, it would be convenient if you would kindly tell us whether you use the words "the Protestant Faith" in the sense of positive truth to be confessed, or

in the sense of negative error to be condemned.

The Delegate. I use the words in the sense of Protest against Rome.

The Irishman. Precisely! Then allow me to tell you, sir, that her Majesty has no right to the title, "Defender of Protest against Rome;" since the title "Fidei Defensor" was conferred on King Henry VIII. by Pope Leo X., in recognition of his Defence of the Seven Sacraments, and of the Divine Authority and infallible teaching of the Holy See. If therefore the "F. D." on the coins of this realm mean anything that is historic or ingenuous, it means that her Majesty is Defender of Papal Supremacy, and that she protests against Martin Luther and all his falsehoods.

The Delegate. You might as well say that because the Archbishop of Canterbury charges his heraldic shield with the Roman Pallium—the symbol of Rome-conferred jurisdiction; or because the Archbishop of York charges his shield with St. Peter's keys—the symbol of Rome-bestowed absolution—therefore the two archbishops profess to derive all their authority

through the assumed successors of the assumed head of your Church.

The Irishman. No, sir, I regret to have to say something more severe. What the Archbishop of Canterbury professes, by displaying the Pallium on his coat of arms, is that all spiritual jurisdiction is derived from the Pope, but that he, unfortunately, does not possess it. And what the Archbishop of York professes, by displaying St. Peter's keys on his coat of arms, is that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were committed to St. Peter, and through him to his successors in all time, but that, unfortunately, having nothing to do with the successors of St. Peter, he has no participation in that royal power.

The Delegate. Well, sir, you can put what construction you please upon historic accidents. Every Protestant knows that "F. D." on the coins of the realm means "Defender of the Faith of the Reformers." Every Protestant knows that the power of the keys means the duty of proclaiming pardon to all penitents, and retribution to all reprobates and unbelievers. And every Protestant knows that the Pal-

lium, now adopted by Dr. Benson, means that the spiritual jurisdiction of all true ministers of the Gospel is derived from the One Shepherd who is in Heaven.

The Irishman. I am thankful to you, sir, for giving us so clear an apprehension of hitherto misunderstood words and symbols. (Laughter.) Perhaps, however, I may now venture to ask you: If "F. D." meant Defender of the Catholic Faith in the time of His Majesty King Henry VIII.; and if the keys of St. Peter meant the power of the Popes through all the centuries that preceded the Reformation; and if the Pallium was the symbol of the spiritual plenitude of the Papal Office, from certainly the time of Pope Symmachus in the fifth century to the time of Pope Leo XIII. in the nineteenth century—the present Pope having just conferred the Pallium on the Archbishop of Westminster by the *same* authority by which his predecessor, St. Gregory the Great, conferred it on St. Augustine of Canterbury—then how do you prove that your Protestant friends in Geneva received a Divine Commission from the Son of God to pronounce

the whole Catholic Church to be in error, or that they were endowed with such supernatural illumination as enabled them to declare themselves to be infallible?

The Delegate. I do not want to prove anything of the kind. The whole Catholic Church had become so corrupt during the middle ages, that it needed no infallibility—it needed only a thoroughly Scriptural mind—to convict it of superstition and idolatry. The religion of England in the earliest centuries was Protestant. *Your* Church caused it to apostatize from that Scriptural Faith.

The Irishman. You assert, sir, that "the religion of England in the earliest centuries was Protestant." If this were so, how came it to pass that the British kings, in the centuries which preceded the Norman Conquest, all acknowledged the Pope as their Spiritual Head?

The Delegate. I deny that they did so.

The Irishman. I affirm that they did so and I will prove it. To begin at the very earliest——

The President. There is an inconvenience

about this irregular mode of controversy. I have no wish to put a stop to free discussion, but I should like the argument to be so conducted that the whole audience might hear it, which is hardly possible in the present position of the new combatant. I have, however, one observation to make, and it is this: The object of this Council was the Reunion of the Churches—the Reunion of the Church of England with the Dissenting bodies, but most certainly *not* with the Church of Rome. (Laughter.) Now the Irish gentleman has introduced a new element, which is outside the purpose of this Council. True, all the delegates have spoken; nor is there any immediate prospect of new proposals; still, it is for the audience to say whether the remainder of the afternoon shall be given up to the Roman Catholic gentleman. Will you kindly express your wishes on the subject? (A large majority decided by vociferous acclamation in favor of listening to the Irishman.) Then, as the audience wish to hear the new combatant, it may be better that he should come up here on to the platform, and take his place as the Irish Catholic Delegate.

(Shouts of applause followed this ruling, with familiar cries and warm expressions of encouragement. The Irish gentleman, who had now received his invitation, moved away from his place in the auditorium, and in a few moments appeared upon the platform. First bowing to the President and the delegates, he addressed himself apologetically to those gentlemen.)

The Irishman. It was not my ambition, gentlemen, to intrude myself into this high company. I had thought to content myself with correcting false statements. But now that I am here, have I your permission to answer the statement that "the early kings of this country were all Protestants;" and to give my proofs that these kings were not only *not* Protestants, but, one and all, most enthusiastic Roman Catholics?

The President. Certainly.

The Irishman. Well, first, gentlemen, I think I may lay it down as a postulate that the religion of the king of any country is the religion of the people of that country. *A for-*

tiori, if, generation after generation, and century after century, *all* the kings of a country professed the same belief, and *all* practised the same devotional customs—and this too in the observation of the whole nation—it would follow necessarily that the faith and devotion of the kings were the faith and devotion of the whole people. May I claim your assent to that proposition?

(Tokens of general approval.)

Then I must ask you: What interpretation can you put upon the fact that all the Saxon kings went to Rome in holy pilgrimage, or else sent their representatives when they could not go? It was no easy matter, in those primitive times, for the Kings Cœadwalla, Ina, Offa, Cænred, Offa, Siric, Burhed, Eardulf, Ethelwulf, and Canute the Dane, or for the Queens Frythogith and Ethelburga, to cross the Alps to pay homage to the Holy Father, and we may be quite sure that they would not have done so had not their faith and their obedience braced them to so energetic a pilgrimage. Venerable Bede tells us that this Roman pilgrimage, exampled by kings and habitually

practised by their subjects, was accomplished by crowds noble and ignoble; and this too spontaneously and with great fervor; and he mentions that the Kings Egbert and Oswy "sent presents to the Apostolic Pope, and many presents of gold and silver." So too King Kenwulf of Mercia dispatched to Rome an annual sum of 365 mancuses, "to support the poor and to supply oil for the numerous lamps in St. Peter's." Ethelwulf, King of Wessex, lavished gifts on the Pontiff, and sent four dishes of silver gilt for Pope Benedict III.; and in his last will he ordered a continuance of his gifts, "in honor of St. Peter, especially to buy oil for the lights of the Church." The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle records that the alms of King Alfred were carried four times to Rome with much ceremony; and William of Malmesbury writes that King Ethelwulf "went to Rome and there offered to St. Peter that tribute which England pays to this day," alluding to what we now call Peter's Pence. King Canute the Dane was inexorable as to this Roman money, enjoining his subjects to pay "the Peter's Pence according to the *ancient* law;"

the legislation of the last of the Saxon kings mentioning "half a mark" as the tax to be imposed by "Danish law," payment to be received between the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul and the Festival known as *Ad Vincula*. I will not weary you with such countless repetitions as the letters of Saxon kings to the Pontiffs; as, for example, when Kenwulf, King of Mercia, wrote to the Pope that he "deemed it fitting to incline the ear of his obedience with all due humility to the Pontiff's holy commands;" or when—in still earlier days, in the second century—Pope Eleutherius received a letter from Lucius, King of the Britons—so styled—asking him that he "might be made a Christian by his orders;" a fact authenticated by Venerable Bede, by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, by William of Malmesbury, by St. Ado's Martyrology, and by the Book of Landaff. It is more to the purpose that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us that King Alfwold went to Rome for a Pall, and invested Eanbald as archbishop; or that King Cœadwalla went to Rome to be baptized; or that Ina, King of Wessex, resigned his crown, and went to Rome and there

entered a religious order; or that King Ethelwulf sent his son Alfred to Rome, and Pope Leo consecrated him king, and took him for a son at Confirmation; or that King Eardwulf of Northumbria, being deposed from his sovereignty, went to Rome to plead his cause with the Pope, and the Pope sent his Legate back with the restored king. I may mention too incidentally that, in the Preface to Dugdale's "Monasticon," it is stated that within five hundred years thirty Anglo-Saxon kings and queens resigned their crowns and became monks and nuns. Moreover, in the Calendar of the old English Church we find the names of about three hundred canonized saints, more than half of whom were of royal birth or connection—a fact significant as to the Catholic faith of the period, and of submission to the Holy See which made them "saints." And now to say a word as to the last of the Saxon kings, the ever-to-be-honored Confessor, St. Edward. Not being able to go to Rome through some infirmity, he begged a commutation of his vow from the Holy See; and the result was your historic Abbey at Westmin-

ster, upon which you gaze with such artistic delight.

Now, gentlemen, that you may realize the full import of this devotion on the part of your early kings to the Sovereign Pontiff, let me ask you to imagine the same spirit in *these* days; the same tone, temper, and warmth of faith on the part of your Protestant kings or Protestant queens, as was shown in earliest times by Catholic sovereigns. Let me ask you to imagine George the Third, or George the Fourth, or William the Fourth, or Queen Victoria, crossing the Alps—even in comfortable royal style—subjecting their religious faith to the Sovereign Pontiff; begging his counsel on both spiritual and temporal matters; commanding that Peter's Pence should be sent to Rome "according to the *ancient* law;" or making bequests in their last testaments "in honor of St. Peter, especially to buy oil for the numerous lamps of the Church." You see at once what a fearful distance you have got away from the faith and practice of the earliest centuries of Christianity. The Delegate for the Imported Sects has hazarded the statement

that "the first centuries of English Christianity were Protestant." I must leave him to settle that libel with those early sovereigns, of whom I have shown that their whole mind was Roman Catholic. I must leave him to settle that libel with St. Edward, the canonized King and Confessor, and his own countryman, who was the founder of that Roman Catholic Abbey in Westminster which you use chiefly for a show place and a burial-ground. Let me speak to you for one moment of that Catholic Abbey. The Sovereign Pontiff gave his consent in early times that the new Abbey should be served by Benedictines, who should be exempt from episcopal jurisdiction; that future sovereigns should be crowned in that Abbey; and further that the charters made in favor of the Abbey should be looked upon as sacred, as irreversible, because they had been Pontifically confirmed. The very words also of the King's Address to the Pontiff, when begging the confirmation of these privileges, showed the national as well as the royal obedience and homage: "To Nicholas, the exalted Father of the Universal Church, Edward, by

the Grace of God King of England, due subjection and obedience." And now, gentlemen, let me say to you—though I say it not with envy but with sorrow: True, you have got possession of St. Edward's Abbey; but now that you have got it, what can you do with it? That Abbey was built for a shrine of Catholic Mysteries. You have converted it into a semi-pagan mausoleum. Look at its marvellous fabric—its intimation! What was the *soul* of that body? It was the adorable Presence on the Altar, round which were grouped the Mysteries of the Communion and the Invocation of Saints, of the Virgin Mother of God, of the Unity of the Faith, and all the worship, the obedience, the love of the whole English nation. Alas, what have you done with the *soul* of that Abbey? Or where is now the jewel within the casket? When I go to that Abbey, to whom can I kneel? To no Sacramental Presence on the Altar; no, nor before an Altar of the Blessed Virgin. The Virgin Mother is gone, with her Divine Son; and in their stead you have men's voices, men's opinions. (Tokens of approval and of warm impression.)

The President (addressing the Irishman). I apprehend that the gist of your controversy is that Reunion would not be possible with the Roman Church, save on condition of absolute submission to the Holy See; and that neither as to authority nor doctrine would your Church make concessions, with a view to reconciliation and peace.

The Irishman. In the very fact, sir, that you can use the word "concessions" in reference to authority and doctrine, you show that you have not grasped Catholic unity. Let me put this before you very simply. Unity is only possible under obedience. Obedience is only possible when the authority which is to be obeyed is recognized as Divine, therefore infallible. How then can a Divine authority make concessions upon doctrine, seeing that doctrine is God's truth, not man's opinion, and is therefore immutable as is God? Concessions as to discipline, concessions as to customs, concessions as to ceremonial observances—all such concessions can be made by Church authority; but to alter the doctrine of the Catholic religion would be to alter the Mind of the Most High;

it would be to stultify the teaching of the Holy Spirit; it would be indeed a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, such as would be inconceivable in the "*Os Dei*," "the mouth of God," the voice of the ever-abiding Trinity. As to any amount of concession in discipline, custom, or ceremony, the Holy See has in all centuries been magnanimous. The Coptic, Maronite, and Catholic Armenian Churches afford evidence of such concessions in abundance. You may remember too that Bede tells us that when St. Augustine was sent to England Pope St. Gregory specially warned him in this language: "You know the custom of the Roman Church in which you were bred. It pleases me that if you have found anything, either in the Roman or the Gallican or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same." And again, the same Pope said, "Where the faith is one, differences of custom do not damage Holy Church." Such liberality, such prudence, such common sense have been habitual with the whole line of Roman Pontiffs. But concessions as to doctrines—no—never.

The President. Then you would maintain that the doctrines of those early kings, of whose devotion to the Holy See you have given examples, were identical with the doctrines of the Roman Church of this day, not only negatively but affirmatively?

The Irishman. Yes, necessarily. Unity under Divine authority is unity in Divine doctrine. The two are as cause and effect. And just as the Church of England, as well as all Non-Conformism, not possessing the faintest shred of Divine authority, are the sport and plaything of every breeze of human opinion—quite as much so as are politics or social science —so the Catholic Church, possessing the Divine promises, has never varied, could not vary, from the Day of Pentecost to this hour, on any doctrine which is of faith unto salvation.

The Ritualist Delegate. As to the question of "never varying" I will not harass you, because I know beforehand what your answer would be. You would say that new definitions, made in answer to new heresies, are not new doctrines but didactic affirmations. Let that pass. I admit that there is a good deal

to be said for it. But now I should like you to quote to us any authority whom we could all accept—and when I say "we" I mean the delegates—as to this point of the *accepted* authority of the Roman See. I do not question your right to put your own interpretation upon this fact or upon that writing in ancient story; I claim the same right for myself and I concede it to you; yet I may challenge you to quote from any reliable historian in whom Anglicans and Non-Conformists have confidence, the vindication of the fact that all Christendom in the earliest times believed in the supreme authority of the Pope.

The Irishman (after hesitating for a few moments). "An authority whom *all* would accept!" There is none! I was thinking whether I might quote to you St. Irenæus (in the second century), who wrote, "All the Churches must depend on the Church of Rome as on their source and head;" and again, "With this Church [of Rome], on account of her more powerful headship, it is necessary that every Church, that is, the faithful everywhere dispersed, should agree." But perhaps

you would not accept St. Irenæus. Then I thought of quoting St. Cyprian, a Bishop in the third century, who wrote, "The See of Rome is the root and womb of the Catholic Church;" and again, to Pope Cornelius he wrote, "All heresies and schisms have sprung from a disregard for the one Priest and Judge to whom Christ has delegated his power." But perhaps you would not highly esteem St. Cyprian. Then I thought of quoting St. Athanasius, a Bishop in the fourth century, who wrote to Pope Felix II., "You are the destroyer of the heresies which devastate the Church; you are the Teacher and Guardian of sound doctrine and unerring faith." But possibly you might have your prejudices against St. Athanasius. Then I thought of quoting Venerable Bede, who said: "All those who separate themselves from the unity of his faith and communion—that is, of St. Peter, and of his successor, the Pope—can never be absolved from the bond of their sins nor enter the gate in the Heavenly Kingdom." But perhaps you would not care for Venerable Bede. Then I thought of quoting the great Council of Sar-

dica, A.D. 347, which wrote to Pope Julius I.: "It is most fitting that the Bishops of the Lord make reference from all the Provinces to the Head, that is, the See of the Apostle Peter;" or again, one century later, the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, which deposed the Archbishop of Alexandria because he had "dared to hold a Council without the authority of the Apostolic See." But it is possible you might not think much of these councils. No: I will take a quite modern authority, one whom most Protestants will accept, and whom few will reject as of no credence. All the world has heard of the late Dr. Döllinger. He founded the sect of the New Protestants, fantastically styled the Old Catholics. Now Dr. Döllinger was not invited to be historian to the Vatican Council, but his writings were doubtless known to Pope Pius IX., and to the majority of the bishops in the Council. When Dr. Döllinger started his little sect, he was eagerly hugged by English Protestants, who have a traditional habit of fondly welcoming apostates, for the simple reason that they hate Catholic unity. (Cries of "Oh, oh!") But Dr. Döllinger had com-

mitted himself to historic statements, to statements in regard to Church history, which have been happily preserved for our edification. If you will permit me, I will read to you two short passages: the one, in regard to the Divine Origin of the Papal Supremacy; the other in regard to the historic fact of that Supremacy having been universally accepted in the early centuries.

In regard to the Divine Origin of the Papacy (and here the Irishman read from his note-book) Dr. Döllinger writes: "Christ gave to Peter four closely allied promises of future power and pre-eminence in the Church: (1) He should be the rock whereon Christ should build; (2) The Church built on him should never fail; (3) Christ would give him the keys of his Kingdom or Church; (4) What he bound or loosed on earth should be bound or loosed in Heaven."

So much in regard to the Divine Origin of the Primacy. But now as to the fact of its recognition by the whole of the Christian Church in the early centuries. I think that the following sentences will suffice:

"The Second General Council," writes Dr. Döllinger, "held in 381, which was a Council of only Oriental Bishops, acquired the authority of an Œcumenical Council by the subsequent acceptance and confirmation of the Pope; St. Augustine declaring after the two African Synods had been confirmed by the Pontiff, 'Roma locuta est, causa finita est.' So again the Council of Ephesus, in forming its judgment against Nestorius, said that it did so following the Canons and the Epistle of the Pope. The same Council also ratified, without any further examination, the Papal condemnation of Pelagianism. . . . At Chalcedon, the Council, in drawing up its dictum on the point of the controversy, did not appeal to the Synod which had been held at Constantinople under Flavian, but only to the decree of the Pontiff. . . . In the judgment upon Eutyches, Cecropius, Bishop of Sebaste, declared in the name of all his brethren that the Bishop of Rome had sent to them a formulary, and that they all followed him and subscribed to his Epistle. The Sixth General Council in like manner declared that it adhered to the dogmatic Epistle of the Pope

Agatho, and by it condemned the heresy." There is an immense deal more of the same kind. In fact Dr. Döllinger fills several pages with his proofs that all Christendom was Roman Catholic, and this too in the very earliest ages. He insists that "Saint Peter was placed in the same relation as Christ had been before him to the collective body of believers, as the good shepherd who cares for the sheep." And I will just quote this one passage on the same point: "Our Lord conferred on this Apostle the supreme authority in the Church. The more the Church was extended, and the more its constitution was formed, the more necessary did the power with which Peter had been invested become, the more evident was the need of a Head which should unite the members of the body—of a point and centre of unity. But as the existence of the Church was to know no other bounds than those of time, the dignity and power that were conferred upon Peter for the preservation of this unity could not die with him, but must have been transferred to others; they were granted *less* to him for the Church of his time than to his successors and the

Church of the following ages." And, finally—for I must yet add these few words—Dr. Döllinger remarks as his own commentary on the fact that the whole of the early Church throughout the world was Roman Catholic: "It was acknowledged to be the prerogative of the first See in the Christian world that the Bishop of Rome could be judged by no man. It was a thing *unheard of* that the Head of the Church should be placed in judgment before his own subjects. He who was not in communion with the Bishop of Rome was not truly in the Catholic Church."

I am afraid, sir, (and here the Irishman addressed the Delegate for the Imported Sects, perhaps from unwillingness to worry the Ritualist Delegate) that you must give up Dr. Döllinger for your friend, in regard to your hypothesis that the faith of the early Church was so painfully and distressingly Protestant.

The Delegate for the Imported Sects. May I ask from what volumes you have been quoting?

The Irishman. The first extract, on the Divine Origin of the Papacy, is from Dr. Döllin-

ger's work on "The First Age of Christianity and the Church," translated by Mr. Oxenham, and published by Messrs. Allen & Co., in 1866; and the extracts on the historic fact of the recognition of the Primacy, with Dr. Döllinger's own comment on that fact, are from his "History of the Church"—and chiefly from the section on "The Pope as Supreme Father and Guardian of the Faith"—translated by Mr. Cox, and published by Mr. Dolman in 1840.

The Delegate for the Imported Sects. Very disgraceful! I had no idea that Dr. Döllinger had fallen into such lamentable mistakes.

The Irishman. There are other authorities who have fallen into lamentable mistakes in regard to this primary question of Divine Authority. I wonder if I might quote to you the language of King Henry VIII., the first founder of the English Protestant religion, *before* the time when the charms of Anne Boleyn had bewitched his soul, his intelligence, his honesty. I conclude—though I may be wrong—that you all look upon Henry VIII. as a chosen vessel for the Reformation of Christendom; (The Ritualist Delegate: "*I* do not") since if he were

not so, he was the most conspicuous apostle of falsehood to which this Christian country has given heed. Now Henry VIII., as you have heard—though Protestant historians have not given that prominence to the fact which ingenuousness or a decent candor would have suggested—wrote a book called "Assertio Septem Sacramentorum," in answer to the ribald profanity of Martin Luther, in which book he fairly demolished that heresiarch. I shall not be wasting your time if I read to you a few sentences from this certainly not too widely circulated publication, written, be it remembered, *before* the time when the unhappy king was taken captive by a weakness he should have shunned. I will confine my extracts to that portion of the "Assertio" which treats of the Pontifical Primacy or Supremacy. Addressing himself to Martin Luther (and here the Irishman proceeded to read from his notebook) Henry VIII. wrote: "I will not offer such an insult to the Pontiff as to discuss anxiously and carefully his right, as if it were a matter of doubt. It is sufficient for my present purpose that his enemy is so much carried

REV. JAMES A. GRANT BEQUEST TO
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY, 1923

away by fury as to destroy his own credit, and clearly show that through malice he is neither consistent with himself nor knows what he says. For he cannot deny that every Church of the faithful acknowledges and venerates the Roman See as its Mother and Primate, unless indeed distance of place and intervening dangers hinder access thereunto: although if those who come hither from the Indies speak the truth, even the Indians, separated from us by so many lands and seas and deserts, are subject to the Roman Pontiff. Therefore if the Pope has obtained this wide and greatly extended power neither by the command of God nor the will of man, but has seized it by force, I would fain know of Luther when he rushed into the possession of so great a territory? The origin of such immense power cannot be obscure, especially if it began in the memory of man. But should he say that it is not older than one or two centuries, let him point out the fact from histories; otherwise, if it be so ancient that the origin of so great a power is obliterated, let him know that it is allowed by the laws that he whose rights ascend so far

beyond the memory of man that their origin cannot be traced, had a lawful beginning; and that it is forbidden by the consent of all nations to move those things which have been for a long time unmoved." And presently the King adds: "When Luther so impudently asserts, and this against his former declaration, that the Pope has no kind of power over the Catholic Church, no, not so much as human, but that he has by sheer force usurped the sovereignty, I greatly wonder how he should expect his readers to be either so credulous or dull as either to believe that a priest without any weapon or company to defend him, as doubtless he was before he became possessed of that which Luther says he has usurped, could ever have hoped to gain, without any right or title, such empire over so many bishops, his equals, in so many different and distant nations; or that all people should believe that all cities, kingdoms, provinces, had been so reckless of their own affairs, rights, and liberties, as to give to a strange priest an amount of power over them, such as he could have hardly dared to hope for. But what matters it what Luther

thinks about this matter, who through anger and malice is ignorant of his own opinion, whilst he clearly shows that his knowledge is darkness, and that his foolish heart is blinded and given up to a reprobate sense to do and say those things which are not fitting? How true is that saying of the apostle: 'Though I have prophecies and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith so as to remove mountains, and have no charity, I am nothing;' of which charity Luther shows how devoid he is, not only by himself perishing through fury, but much more by endeavoring to draw all others with him into destruction; whilst he strives to dissuade them from obeying the Chief Bishop, to whom he himself is bound by a triple bond, as a Christian, as a priest, and lastly as a friar, hereafter to be punished by God in a triple way."

The Delegate for the Imported Sects. I do not believe that Henry VIII. wrote that book. It was written for him by More, or Fisher, or Wolsey, or by some one of the Papistical fanatics of the period.

The Irishman. That Henry did himself write

that book I take to be a matter of certainty, and for reasons which I will now briefly give. First, he was competent to write it. Erasmus, in a letter to Duke George of Saxony, speaks of the King's fondness for theology, and of his habit of theological disputation. He says: "The prince has a happy and versatile genius, which succeeds wonderfully in whatever it undertakes. When he was a boy, he cultivated diligently his style." And he adds, "I have never doubted that the book, which you rightly praise, is the work of him whose name it bears." In a letter also to Archbishop Warham, Erasmus says: "I am persuaded that the book has been written by the King himself." Moreover, Fisher, More, and Wolsey repudiated the authorship; Fisher saying emphatically, "The King is now called Defender of the Faith *suis meritis*," while in a sermon preached in 1521 he said: "The King's Grace hath with his own pen substantially foughten against Martin Luther." As to the King's own public assertion of his authorship, his language is so clear as to be conclusive. In his "Regis Angliæ Responsio ad M. Luther,

Ep.," 1562, he says: "Now however much you may pretend to believe that the book published by me is not mine, but forged in my name by cunning sophists, yet many far more worthy of credence than your 'trustworthy witnesses' know it to be mine, and I myself acknowledge it."

Yet the question is not so much, "Did Henry write the book?" as "Did the book convey the King's belief, the belief of the English nation, and of all Catholics?" The answer is, that Henry sent copies of the book to all Catholic princes who were friendly with him; and thus obviously took for granted these three facts: (1) That all Catholic princes of his time were of one mind with himself as to the Pope's Paternity; (2) That throughout all England, both the clergy and the laity would take the expression of such orthodoxy as a matter of course; and (3) That Luther's novelties were regarded as so fantastically idiotic that they merited rather contempt than disputation.

At this point a messenger came on to the platform and handed a scrap of paper to the

President. After reading it the President announced to the audience:

I have received a few words from a Colonial Bishop, which I think it is my duty to read to you. His Lordship says:

"I have been present at this debate for several hours, and I have heard nothing that was not evasive or disloyal. I shall now leave the hall. It was the duty of the Anglican Delegates to have proved to the audience the Continuity of the Church of England from the ancient Church. As they have not attempted to do so, I will not be present any longer at what I regard as a solemn travesty of clerical duty."

A good deal of profane laughter followed the reading of this letter, mixed with cheers of approval from many Anglicans. The President seemed undecided how to act. He evidently felt that a critical moment had arrived, and that the Council was in danger of being brought to naught. Nothing had thus far been done toward Reunion, and it was certain that nothing would be done. In his dilemma the President appeared to be considering what

course he should adopt for his own credit; and after a minute or two he appealed to the audience, preferring to leave the decision with them.

The President. Before we go to tea—and I think that a moment has arrived when we may all reasonably indulge in that festivity (cheering)—it may be well that we see how far we have got, and decide what we shall do in the evening. Let me first put before you our position; so that, having retraced the course of our deliberations, we may see what we have lost, what we have gained. The Low Church Delegate led off this morning with an earnest appeal to all Dissenters that they would come *inside* the really expansive National Church. The Broad Church Delegate, immediately following, was equally earnest in his exhortation that all Dissenters should stay *outside* that Institution. And the argument of the Low Churchman was that the Church, being comprehensive, charitably included all the shades of Non-Conformism; while the argument of the Broad Churchman was that, if the Church were so comprehensive, it could not exclude the very people whom it included. We next listened to

an able speech by the Ritualist Delegate, of which the burden was, "*Wait* for a dozen years, until the Church of England be perfected in Catholicity." This counsel, doubtless admirable in some aspects, did not satisfy the gifted Delegate for the Wesleyans, who proceeded to roughly handle the Ritualist's arguments, and indeed to severely lecture him on inconsistency. In the afternoon, the Salvationist Delegate asked us all to join General Booth's army; but the invitation was not accepted with unanimity. The next speaker was the Delegate for the Home-Made Sects, who repudiated all Anglican schools save the Evangelical; and by his caustic satire on the "Three Big Churches in the Establishment" put all hope of reconciliation out of the question. The Delegate for the Imported Sects—I am sure sincere in his convictions — rather indulged in ardent Protestantism than in amenity; and so opened a way for a new advocacy—quite unlooked for though not unwelcome to the audience—that of the obviously sincere Irish Catholic. I think therefore I may go so far as to say positively: There is *no hope* of the Reunion of the

Churches; and it rests with the audience to decide at once whether the Council shall be continued, or shall be broken up as fruitless and unworthy. And yet it seems to me there is one way of escape. In the letter which I have read to you from the Colonial Bishop, there is a warm insistence on the duty of the Church Delegates to "prove the Continuity of the Church of England from the primitive Catholic Church in this country." Well, it seems to me—and I say it with regret—that, as there is now no hope of the Reunion of the Churches, I may ask you: Is it your pleasure that this subject of Continuity shall be discussed in this hall after tea? It is true that the subject has been treated indirectly by more than one speaker in this Council, yet it is obvious that there is a good deal more to be said about it. "Continuity" is certainly now the great watchword of the Church of England—at least of the High Church or Ritualist party—and I own that if the theory be sound, and the realization also can be brought within practical view, there would be a substantial ground on which to argue that the Reunion of the Churches might

be still made desirable for all good men. I can only speak for myself; for I do not know whether the delegates and the audience take my own view of the importance of this question. Let me put it to the vote. Will those who are in favor of discussing "Continuity," so soon as we meet again, in about half an hour, be so good as to hold up a hand?

(A show of hands decided the question in the affirmative, and the audience dispersed to take their tea.)

THE EVENING.

It was natural that the evening audience should be small. The President having affirmed, at the close of his address, that there was "no hope of a Reunion of the Churches," the major part of the audience looked on the subject as ended, and on the Council as a miserable fiasco. Only the few who took an interest in "Continuity" cared to return for an academic discussion, which might possibly have charms for the Clergy and the Ritualists, but which was of too narrow a compass to engage the many. The President had evidently anticipated a small gathering, for he had invited private friends to the platform; so that there was rather the expectation of a friendly talk than fear of further failure from discussion. The Editor of these pages was accompanied by the few friends whom he had met at the pleasant luncheon in the morning; Mr. Armytage in particular being interested in the question,

"What can the delegates possibly make out of Continuity?" Indeed Mr. Armytage so constantly interrupted the Editor, while he was endeavoring to make accurate shorthand notes, that it was difficult to fulfil that duty satisfactorily.

The President looking around him, was perhaps gratified to assure himself that the Irish gentleman had not returned to the hall. The seven delegates were, however, all in their places.

About a dozen invited clergymen imparted dignity to the platform, while the hall was certainly not more than half full.

"Will *you*, sir," inquired the President of Canon Courtly, "kindly open the discussion upon Continuity?"

"I do not believe in the necessity of it," answered that gentleman; a confession which was received with much amusement.

"Will *you*, sir," asked the President of Dr. Wylde.

"I frankly confess," said Dr. Wylde, "that Continuity in different doctrinal beliefs, or

Continuity in different ideas upon authority, appears to me to be a contradiction in terms."

The President then looked inquiringly at the Dissenting Delegates, but they only smiled, and seemed to say, "This is not our province."

The Rev. Sebastian Stole then became an object of personal interest, and at once responded to the invitation of the President by a few words which were lucid and appropriate.

Rev. Sebastian Stole. In my own sense of Continuity, it means, first, the possession of true Orders; next, the profession of the primitive faith; and thirdly, the unbroken heritage of all the wealth of the Christian Covenant, coming down to us from the time of the apostles. That the Church of England has Continuity I am persuaded from the three facts that she has true Orders, true Sacraments, and true Faith; and while no one deplores more than I do the hideous heritage of the Reformation, with its anti-Christian sweeping away of Catholic altars, and its substitution of a purely Commemorative Celebration, I do not permit myself to confuse the horrors of a revolution with the crime of apostasy or even heresy. The

Reformation was an historical accident, not affecting the *soul* of the English Church, but only mutilating its body in many members. It left the Church Catholic because Continuous. The scandals of the Reformation were not schismatical; they were almost every one of them political. They assaulted the faith, but did not kill it; they even attacked Continuity, but did not break it. It has been the probation of the Catholic Church in all ages to have to pass through terrible trials of faith. In our own time we have had many such trials; yet I look forward to a period when, abuses being removed, and the primitive tone being thoroughly restored to the Church of England, all Englishmen will confess that the Church of England *alone* is the true heir of Continuity from the Early Church.

(This was felt to be a very modest beginning, and hardly fitted to stimulate discussion. The Broad Church Delegate, Dr. Wylde, who was sitting next to Mr. Stole, remarked quietly, after rising from his chair:)

Rev. Dr. Wylde. I must own that, as a Broad Churchman, and having no sympathy

with Ritualism—but rather looking upon Dissenters as being quite as good Christians as are Anglicans whether High Church or Low—I am disposed to estimate this question of Continuity as being abstract, inutile, and impracticable. Indeed I regard it as *de facto* impossible, and *de jure* unreal or equivocal. Continuity *of* what and *from* what? Now, first, what is the simple meaning of Continuity? It can only mean the continuance of the same Faith through channels which are accepted as of the same authority. If there has ever been interruption in that continuance, the break would create a gulf which would be impassable. On the same principle that "the strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link," it may be argued that the loss of any one link—*a fortiori* the loss of a dozen links—in the chain of the High Church claim to Continuity, would mean practically that there was no chain at all. Now the Church of England, it seems to me, has positively *no* link with the British Church, on account of the changes, both in Authority and Doctrine, which have convulsed it since its rupture with the Holy See. All

the links of its Continuity have been smashed to atoms. Or,—if I may use a rough simile,—I should say that its Continuity is of the same kind as is that of a broken watch-guard, which, having one link fastened to the waistcoat, and one link fastened to the watch in the waistcoat pocket, has *no* link between those extreme links, and therefore, to the ordinary intelligence, *non est*. Remember that I am not arguing with reference to belief in Christ—for *that* may be continuous in all ages; I am arguing solely with the Ritualist claim of Continuity *from and through* the Roman Catholic Church.

Now, to begin with, the Ritualists believe in the Apostolic Succession, and they claim to possess that succession from the earliest times, right through the middle ages and the Reformation. I maintain that this claim is historically unsound, while morally it is destructive and suicidal. Have I your permission to give my reasons for this view?

(Assent on the part of the President and of Mr. Stole.)

Well, I was much struck, if I may say so, with what the Wesleyan Delegate said this

morning, in regard to the fictitious claim to Roman Orders; and were it not that "Continuity" calls for it, I would not add anything to his remarks. As he observed forcibly, not only do the Roman Church and the Czar's Church reject the Anglican Orders as of no value, but all the Reformers, and all High Churchmen since Laud's time, have regarded them as a very "open" question indeed. How was it possible that they could do otherwise? The deposition of a whole bench of bishops by the civil authority was an event as unprecedented in English history as it was absolutely null and void in ancient law. The *Ecclesia Docens* must have remained with the deposed bishops —that is, if you accept the Catholic theory. Queen Elizabeth could no more create a Divine Right than she could create an Apostolical Succession. The whole spirituality of England protested against the act of the Queen's government; and as it was known that one-half of the deposed bishops had been appointed *before* the time of Queen Mary, no quibble could be hazarded, or was hazarded, in regard to their thoroughly Catholic institution. And

into the place of the deposed bishops were put —*who?* Why, men who were, all but one, bitter Calvinists, and who loathed Episcopacy as they loathed the Sacrifice of the Mass. Indeed, so difficult was it to get bishops for the New Church, that, in 1559, a bill had to be passed through Parliament, giving the Queen power to "collate or appoint bishops *without* rites or ceremonies;" and seven years later another Act was passed, which decreed that such appointments were valid, in spiritual sense, "any matter or cause to the contrary notwithstanding;" the Queen, "by her supreme power and authority," dispensing from all disabilities and imperfections. As the historian, Mr. Froude, says, "The Queen desired to dress up her bishops as counterfeits of the Catholic hierarchy; and half in reverence, half in contempt, compel them to assume the name and character of a priesthood, which both she and they knew in their hearts to be an illusion and a dream."

Rev. Sebastian Stole. Yet you are aware that Pope Pius IV. sent his Nuncio to England in 1560, with an offer to agree to all the

changes in the English liturgy, and to recognize the valid appointment of the bishops, if only his supremacy were acknowledged?

Rev. Dr. Wylde. I should be disposed to discredit that statement. The whole story was first fathered upon Coke, who denied that he had invented such a fib. Fuller, whom I think we must accept as being unprejudiced, says he "found the tale to have originated with those who love to feign what they cannot find, that they may never appear to be at a loss." The truth is, the Pope's envoy was not allowed to land in England; and what his instructions were, if he had any, nobody knows. Now I think I need not weary you with a discussion of the vexed question: Were Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins—four unfrocked, degraded, and excommunicated friars—capable of consecrating the first Protestant archbishop —"consecrating" in the *Catholic* sense? The Act of 1565 answered that question. In the very fact that the Act said that "by the authority of this present Parliament" such appointment and consecration are rendered valid, "any matter or thing that can be objected to

the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding," we trace the consciousness of Parliament, and also of the Queen, that these consecrations were not *Catholic* consecrations. Hence the new bishops were nicknamed "Parliamentary bishops;" for all the world knew the fiction of their ordination, just as all the world knew the fiction of their jurisdiction. And in 1662 the Calvinistic rite of Cranmer, by which these ultra-Protestant Orders had been conferred, was put aside by Anglicans on the very ground that it was insufficient; in other words, they said: "The new Succession is no Succession." It cannot be too often insisted upon, that *all* the English bishops holding office under Queen Mary refused to hand on the Succession to Elizabeth's clergy; and that without their co-operation no "canonical" succession was possible by the laws of the ancient Church. Of the four quasi-episcopal starters of the new Church, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins were not provincial bishops, nor had they been consecrated by the Ritual of the English Church, but only by Cranmer's Protestant rite; and as to Barlow, let it suffice that he did not believe

in Ordination, but thought that "only the appointing was sufficient;" and that "laymen had otherwhiles made priests" when Christian Princes were in want of true bishops. While, as to the great body of the Reformers, they spoke of Orders with such contempt—using language which would be repugnant to modern ears, from its coarseness both of sentiment and of epithet—that it would be madness to suppose that they believed in what they scorned, or that they possessed what they repudiated with such disgust.

If any one therefore can rest his faith in the "*Catholicity*" of the Church of England —in the sense used by our modern ultra High Churchmen—on the ground of the certainty of its Roman Succession, it seems to me that he exhibits a credulity in a spiritual matter which he would regard as simply insane in any temporal matter; and that his conception of a "Catholic" priesthood is, after all, not more lofty than that of the conception of an ordained ministry by Non-Conformists. Indeed of the two I much prefer the Dissenting view. Dissenters at least do *not believe* in the Apostolical

Succession; they believe only in personal fitness for the ministry; whereas the High Church party affect to believe in a doubtful fact, which never has been proved and never can be; and which, if it *were* proved, would only brand their ancestors as apostates, and themselves as in Continuity from apostasy. (Cheers from the Dissenting party.)

Canon Courtly. It appears to me that Continuity, in the Ritualist sense of the word, must be tested by consistency, by common sense. I do not go so far as the Broad Church Delegate, who advises all Dissenters to "stop outside the Church of England;" because I think that ecclesiastical harmony would be edifying, as well as helpful to the conversion of the heathen. Still, I must say that if the Catholic Continuity is to be made so much of in the existing Church of England, it ought to be primarily indicated by the sameness of Anglican Belief with the Belief of Catholic ages, Catholic clergy. But has there ever been this sameness? No, there never has been and there is not now. So that to make such a great point of Continuity of Catholic priest-

hood, while utterly ignoring Continuity of Catholic Belief, appears to me irrational, absurd.

(The Wesleyan Delegate now rose, and quickly interested all the persons in the hall, equally the Churchmen and the Dissenters.)

Rev. Walter Sterling. Were you not struck, gentlemen, by the opening words of the last speaker: "Continuity in the sense now approved by High Churchmen must be tested by consistency, by common sense"? Now, I am going to test Continuity in this way; yet not by a purely modern array of testimony, but by taking you back to the time of Queen Elizabeth. My question is—and I shall put it to every one of you—"Can common sense justify the view that Anglicanism was in Continuity from Roman Catholicism?" If it were *not* so, there is an end of Continuity; for, as the Broad Church Delegate remarked, a chain of which even *one* link is wanting is not a chain but severed links; *a fortiori* if for forty years there was the complete rupture of *all* kinds of Continuity, it would be simply idle, it would be frivolous, to insist on the pretension that

Anglicanism is in Continuity from Mediævalism.

Now suffer me to draw for you *a sketch of the reign of Queen Elizabeth* by way of illustrating what I mean by "broken links." I will not quote one Roman authority. Anglicans alone shall tell the tale. In the autumn of last year there appeared in the *Guardian* newspaper—may I say, the most reliable of your Church newspapers?—some articles by Mr. Pocock, an acknowledged high authority on the Anglicanism of the Tudors and the Stuarts. I read those articles yesterday, and my memory is quite fresh as to the more salient of the assertions and admissions. I will, however, refer to my note-book, if necessary. I was first struck by the fact that the English sees were kept vacant—Bristol and Ely were kept vacant for thirty years, and Oxford for almost the whole of the Queen's reign—so that her Majesty might enjoy the episcopal revenues; every bishop entering his bishopric under simoniacal contracts, made either with the Queen or her favorites. The Zwinglians and the Calvinists, who, in the reign of Queen

Mary, had taken refuge in the various towns of Switzerland, were the men from whom Elizabeth chose her bishops; "and probably," says Mr. Pocock, "not a single bishop was to be found who believed in his own Divine commission, or in the efficacy of the sacraments."

But as with the new bishops, so with the new clergy. Mr. Pocock frankly ridicules the popular delusion that many priests conformed to the Queen's religion. The poorer clergy were compelled to abstain from open protest so as to avoid the terrible punishment which would have followed; but the fact that vast numbers of English parishes had no clergy—in the Ely diocese only 52 parishes out of 152 being served by any kind of Protestant clergymen; in the Norwich diocese only half; in the Lincoln diocese only half; and in two Welsh dioceses none at all—shows how true was Bishop Jewel's admission to Peter Martyr, "Now that religion is everywhere changed, the Mass priests absent themselves altogether from public worship, as if it were the greatest impiety to have anything in common with the people of God." Indeed only 806 out of (an asserted)

9400 of the clergy were "returned" as being willing to take the oath. Only one-tenth of them presented themselves before the (first) Commissioners; most of the rest being deprived of their cures. Mechanics had to be employed to read the service in empty churches, with "cobblers, weavers, tinkers, tanners, and fiddlers," and Presbyterian and Lutheran ministers had to be invited to do the work of the "inheritors of the Apostolic Succession." Every vestige of the old religion was swept away. So that the Church of England, once Catholic, became in the reign of Queen Elizabeth almost everything in the world *except* Catholic; and, as Hallam says in his "Constitutional History," "Some Catholics frequented our churches because the law compelled them to do so, not out of a notion that very little change had been made by the Reformation."

As to the English masses, we can almost imagine what must follow. Outward conformity to the new order was perhaps the rule. When every one was fined for not attending the Queen's worship (save the few favored ones

who were allowed dispensations), it was natural that only the minority would be martyrs, the multitude conforming while abhorring. Yet it is perfectly marvellous, considering the weakness of human nature, and considering also the poverty of the masses, what a large number preferred to stay *outside* the churches to participating in the Act of Parliament service. Moreover, the new clergy being an utterly ignorant class of men, "rude and unlearned ministers," as Burleigh called them, being also Calvinists or else Zwinglians, were utterly contemned by the common people, while as to their new worship—called "May game" or "Christmas game"—it was ridiculed by the people in every ale-house, and if possible still more ridiculed in the churches; Bishop Pilkington of Durham speaking of the "walking, talking, chidings, fightings, that had been going on in the church—and that especially in time of Divine service;" and adding "A Popish summoner, spy, or promoter, will drive more to a church with a word, to hear a Latin Mass, than seven preachers will bring in a week's preaching to hear a godly sermon . . . nor

can Christian rulers, *by the whip of discipline*, drive others forward." The Ecclesiastical Commissioners made a report, in which, among other scandals of clergy and laity, they speak of "the people swarming in the streets and ale-houses during service time; so that in many churches there is only the curate and the clerk, and open markets are kept during service time. Cock-fights and unlawful games are tolerated on Sunday during Divine service, and justices of the peace and ecclesiastical commissioners are present." And this state of things, be it remembered, lasted right down to the time of Archbishop Laud, in whose days, as the state papers tell us, "the congregation sat, the men wearing their hats or not, as it suited their convenience; the communion table standing in the body of the church, being made the receptacle for such hats and clothes as were not worn, and frequently used as a seat by any one who was not accommodated with a pew." And in the same spirit the state papers of the reign of Elizabeth record for us that Scory, Bishop of Hereford, wrote to Cecil, "My cathedral is a very nursery of blasphemy,

impurity, pride, superstition and ignorance;" Bishop Best of Carlisle reporting his clergy to be "wicked imps of hell;" while the Vicar-General of Lincoln, in his visitation of the diocese, September 19th, 1634, said: "Many Prebendaries have never seen the church; alehouses, hounds, and swine are kept in the church-yard very offensively; at Louth the clergy and laity are much given to drunkenness, the goodly church of Boston is much decayed, whilst at Huntingdon the vicar of Odell never uses his surplice, or makes the sign of the cross at baptism, and at Alesbury the clergy perform clandestine marriages with gloves and masks on." The churchwardens of Knotting in Bedfordshire were charged before the official commissioners of the archdeacon with "having allowed for the last three years cock-fighting to go in the chancel of the church; the minister of the church with his sons being present and enjoying the sport." So that we can hardly wonder that the whole kingdom was so demoralized that the Bishop of Norwich, in 1635, could report to the government: "In all the churches of the city of

Norwich there is not one in which there is any morning service or sermon."

Now the question to be asked, after this slight sketch of a whole reign—ay, and right down to the time of Archbishop Laud—is, *Whence* do you get your Continuity of worship, any more than your Continuity of Orders? If I were an Anglican, it seems to me that I should fervently pray that the Apostolical Succession might be a myth. ("Oh, oh!" and laughter.) Why, how was it possible, as I remarked to you this morning, that the heirs of the *same* Apostolical Succession could approve and practise opposite Christian worships? The whole reign of Queen Elizabeth was, to use a common parlance, rabidly and deliriously anti-Catholic, so far as the New Anglican Bishops, priests, and laity were concerned. If, therefore, you can maintain that you derive your Catholic Continuity—of priesthood, of worship, of dogma—through forty years of destructively Protestant Elizabethanism, you can maintain that you derive strength and health from forty years' submergence under the seas; or that between this earth and the

moon the connection is so intimate, that the inhabitants of both are all as twins. (Amusement.)

Rev. Sebastian Stole. The sole cause of the whole imbroglio was persecution. I do not see how Continuity can be affected by Queen Elizabeth's persecution of Roman priests, or by her legal indorsement of a Protestant service. We must remember that, as Macaulay says, the whole Reformation was "a political job;" the spiritual powers of the clergy remaining intact amid the triumph of evil for the time being.

(The Wesleyan Delegate waited for a moment, to see if any one else would respond, and then said brusquely, as was his wont:)

Rev. Walter Sterling. Persecution! You say that persecution did not stop Continuity. Now I will just take this subject of persecution —if the delegates will grant me a few more moments—and will argue that the persecution *itself* was the strongest possible disproof of Continuity. I must treat of the story of persecution as *a whole*, so as to trace its argumentative force.

Queen Elizabeth was the greatest persecutor that ever lived.

Mr. Moore. What! Greater than Queen Mary?

The Wesleyan. Yes, greater, because she persecuted right through forty years, without an interval of even twenty-four hours. Yet we hear a good deal of the Marian persecutions, but we hear nothing of the persecutions under Elizabeth. Now though the point is, for the moment, a digression, yet as you have mentioned Mary's reign I will speak of it. It is not always remembered that, in the reign of Queen Mary, the very men who were guilty of being persecutors had been persecuted themselves in the previous reign; and it was moreover in Edward's reign, as you all know, that Cranmer—who in Henry VIII.'s reign had burnt Anne Askew for denying the doctrine of the Real Presence—burnt Joan Bocher for some peculiar views as to the Incarnation, and soon afterward burnt a Dutch Unitarian, and also a number of Anabaptists. This wretch, Cranmer—the Robespierre of the Reformation—compiled a criminal code, in which all specifi-

cally Roman doctrines should expose their professors to death, and this too by the horrible process of burning. So that when he was at length executed in Mary's reign, all the world felt he had only got his due. Now, for my part, I abhor persecution, whether it be by Catholics or by Protestants. ("Hear, hear!") Yet I will venture to make this one remark—though the remark is not my own, for it was made to me a few days ago by a Roman Catholic: When Catholic governments have persecuted they have at least had this apology, that the Catholic Church professed itself to be infallible; whereas when Protestant governments have persecuted, they have had no apology at all, for they have always professed that their Protestantism was fallible. Now that a religion which says, "I *can* teach you," should persecute may be cruel, but it is not illogical; but that a religion which says, "I *cannot* teach you," should persecute is not only illogical but contemptible.

Now how came Queen Elizabeth to persecute? The answer is the death-blow to Continuity. She persecuted because her only chance of

being Queen was to cut herself off from Continuity, and to start a *new* Church which in Orders, Faith, Fellowship, should have nothing in common with the old Church. As Dean Milman says, in his Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral, "Elizabeth's bishops, especially all the more prominent, Parker the primate and the Bishop of London, were in truth the real founders of the Church of England. Elizabeth's bishops were steadfastly determined against the *old* religion, and were resolutely fixed and fully in unison in their *new* creeds." And as the only way in which it was possible to establish a state religion was by the most odious and sustained persecution, the Queen proceeded to murder those who possessed Catholic Continuity, or to banish them from her terror-stricken kingdom. Catholic Continuity fled to the seminaries beyond the seas; Rome, Valladolid, Seville, Madrid, Lisbon, with numerous Catholic refuges all over Europe, became its extemporized homes; Jesuits, Benedictines, Carmelites, Franciscans, Carthusians, Cistercians, with hosts of exiled Seculars, and also Nuns, took with them Catholic Continuity

to Catholic countries; and then, year by year, sent their missionaries to England, to die for the faith of the Roman Church. St. Philip Neri, as I read the other day, would take his stand at the gate of a Roman college to watch the English seminarists starting for England, and would salute them with "*Salvete flores martyrum*," well knowing that they were on the direct road to Tyburn. Meanwhile, in England, what an agony! The true heirs of Continuity, seeking refuge in holes and corners, were subjected to every imaginable persecution; "inquisitors of heretical pravity," or, as they were commonly called, "searchers," were sent into towns and villages to hunt up Catholics; and when they trapped them, what then? Poor Margaret Clitheroe, "for harboring a priest," was crushed to death by the *peine forte et dure;* one hundred and forty-two priests were hanged, of whom one hundred and twenty-six died for exercising priestly functions, while eighty more died of torture in prisons. Queen Elizabeth was the worthy daughter of Henry VIII. Just as that debauched and murderous tyrant hung Carthu-

sian monks at their monastery gates, because they would not acknowledge his royal supremacy, and slew Fisher, More, Garnet, and scores of monks because they would not bend the knee to his Pontificate; so did Elizabeth kill the bodies or crush the souls of all her subjects who openly professed their Continuity with the Catholic Church, or who were accused and found guilty of that crime. The "priest-catchers" were authorized to break into private houses to search for the faithful heirs of Continuity; while Queen Elizabeth's archbishop presided over the Court of High Commission to "conduct inquiries by rack, torture, and inquisition." Indeed, as Hallam says in his history, "The rack seldom stood idle in the Tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign." Confiscations and outlawry, the seizure of Catholic children, everything that human malice could conceive, were tried for the extermination of Continuity; the true spirit of the "Reformation"—an outbreak, as Macaulay has put it, which was "begun by Henry the murderer of his wives, continued by Somerset the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth the

murderer of her guest"—was given the freest, the wildest play for forty years, in the fond hope of obliterating the Roman Church; so that, as Montalembert has expressed it, "The Church of England was one of the most awful forms of sin and pride that have ever appeared in the world;" and again he wrote, "The authors of that Church could find their models amongst the monsters who reigned at Rome while the Church was in the catacombs."

And permit me to say one word about Ireland. To show how ubiquitous was this persecution, let it be mentioned that in the seventeenth century an oath was administered to all Irishmen, including the denial of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the Sacrifice of the Mass, of Purgatory, of the Authority of the Pope—in short, of the whole Roman faith. Englishmen compelled Irishmen to abjure the Roman religion, in homage to the suave tolerantism of the Church of England! Ah, I will not allude—it is better not—to the horrors of Cromwell's time; to the slave markets of Jamaica and the West Indies, with the splendid business of Bristol slave-dealers in Irish flesh—

eight thousand Irish were sold in five years; to the exile of a hundred thousand Catholics for their religion during two years of these unequalled atrocities; to the massacre of priests, women, and children in the distant settlements to which the Government consigned them: no, such things ought to shame the hearts of all Christians. Well might Dr. Johnson say, "Even in the Ten Persecutions there is no instance of such severity as the Protestants in Ireland have exercised over the Catholics;" and well might the great statesman Burke say, "Our penal code against the Catholics was savage as anything that ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." We, Dissenters, can deeply sympathize with Roman Catholics; for we too have had our full share of persecution, and have been ostracized by generations of English Churchmen, because we would not accept their Royal religion. ("Hear, hear!" from the Dissenting party.)

Now do you agree with me, or do you not, that it was impossible that the Anglican clergy should be true heirs of the Roman Catholic Continuity; seeing that the Anglican clergy

cruelly tortured the Catholic clergy, while reviling almost every article of their faith? This is what I call a moral argument; and I much prefer moral arguments to sophistical ones, because they appeal to the common sense of all mankind. You may speculate as you like about Barlow's consecration, about the sufficiency of Cranmer's rite of ordination, or about Roman Catholics becoming schismatics by their expatriation; but I take my stand upon common sense; and I affirm that an Anglican clergy which, throughout the reign of Queen Elizabeth, assisted at the execution of Catholic priests; which for three centuries has hated Catholic priests, and for three centuries has hated Catholic doctrines—*cannot* have a Continuity of Catholicity. You Ritualist gentlemen forget that it was only the day before yesterday when you began your Anglican novelties about "Anglo-Catholicism;" but all the world remembers it though you do not. For three hundred years your ancestry were Protestant—bitterly, cruelly Protestant and persecuting. Dissenters have good reason to know *that!* And now that you talk of your Conti-

nuity from the Catholic Church—the real Catholic Church meanwhile disowning you!—we Dissenters cannot help smiling and asking ourselves: "How can this disowned and disowning son claim the Catholic Church for a Mother, without first asking pardon of that Mother?" We Dissenters have nothing to do with the Church of England, and nothing to do with the Church of Rome. You, the Ritualists, are either the disowned children of the Church of Rome, or else you have no parentage whatever. Either way you have no Continuity.

(At this point a conversation took place between the President and a gentleman who was sitting next to him, and whose name, as it afterward transpired, was Professor Mildmay —a professor in one of the best English colleges. The subject of the conversation remained a secret; but presently the President addressed the delegates, and sought to open out a new line of argument.)

The President. If I mistake not, gentlemen, the question of Continuity may be argued on far-reaching historic grounds. Hitherto the

discussion has been narrowed to the Reformation; but I know that the vast majority of High Churchmen *pass over* the Reformation in their argument, and claim to trace Continuity from such very early times as the centuries antecedent to St. Augustine. Now I think it would be interesting if we went back to the beginning—say, to the time of St. Augustine's mission in the sixth century. May I ask the Ritualist Delegate whether he clings to the theory that *before* the time of the mission of St. Augustine the British Church was independent of Rome; so that when St. Augustine landed in Britain he found the Britons unwilling to receive him—indeed hostile to the claims of the Roman Pontiff?

Rev. Sebastian Stole. I should be disposed to say bluntly: The Britons in 596 *could not* have been Roman Catholic, or they would have obeyed the Pope's emissary in all things, and certainly as to the time of keeping Easter. The fact that, on the contrary, they refused to obey the Pope's emissary proves that they were not Roman Catholic.

(No one answering, the President spoke

privately to Professor Mildmay, and that gentleman seemed to accept an invitation. The professor rose slowly from his chair. He was so bland and so polite that it was not easy to anticipate on which side of a contest he would range himself. He was one of those men who seem at first to agree with you—until you find to your astonishment in the course of a few moments that they differ from you on every possible point. With more than his usual suavity he bowed to Mr. Stole, and said:)

Professor Mildmay. I should quite concur with the Rev. Mr. Stole in his *prima facie* estimate of the Augustine mission. It seems so obvious that the early Britons were not Roman Catholic, if we may judge only from this one speaking incident of their rejection of a missionary sent from Rome. ("Hear, hear!" from Mr. Stole.) I was deeply impressed with this view from my earlier study of history, especially from a work I read called "Theophilus Anglicanus," which was written by a distinguished Anglican bishop. That work was composed to show that the modern Church of England was the same Church with the

Primitive British Church—in fact, to prove what is now called Continuity. Subsequently I examined critically into the subject; for I wanted to know *why* the Britons refused to change their Easter in obedience to the pleading of the Pope's emissary. I discovered some strangely enlightening facts, though not quite in the direction I had looked for. I discovered that the British Easter in 596 had been the *original* Roman Catholic Easter. This seemed to me curious. Then I found that the Emperor Constantine, A.D. 326,—as Eusebius tells us in his "De Vita Constantini,"—certified that "the *same* Easter was observed in the City of Rome, and through all Italy, Africa, Egypt, Spain, Gaul, *Britain*, and all Achaia." Searching next into the "Annales Cambriæ" I found the entry: "This year, A.D. 453, Easter is changed on Sunday, with Pope Leo, Bishop of Rome." I also found that the Council of Nice boldly asserted that the British and Roman Easter were identical. So that it became evident to me that the early Britons were in communion with the Holy See two or three centuries before the time of St. Augustine. I

therefore sought for the solution of the episode we are referring to in some other possibly enlightening channels. I found that solution, and it was as follows: The Britons and the Saxons were bitter enemies. St. Augustine came to the Britons *through* the Saxons, and was therefore regarded as an enemy. Venerable Bede explains the whole matter in this one sentence: "To other acts of unspeakable wickedness the Britons added this, that they would never commit the word of faith by preaching to the race of Saxons or Angles that dwelt with them in Britain." And, as we all know, so crushing was this enmity that the Saxons drove the Britons clean out of the country into Wales and into Brittany in France. I think, therefore, we have a clear solution of the episode. The early Britons had been from the first Roman Catholic. Their quarrels with the Saxons made them inimical to St. Augustine, who came to them from the Saxon King Ethelbert, and urged them to try to convert their hated rivals. I do not trace Anglican Continuity in the episode. I trace only the normal wickedness of a savage war.

(Mr. Stole not responding, the President said:)

The President. Could you quote to us any parallel circumstances in the time you are referring to, which would indicate that the Pope's Supremacy was accepted? "Continuity" seems to largely depend on your answer.

Professor Mildmay. Briefly: I will make only two remarks: the first is that the Roman Liturgy, brought by St. Augustine to this country, was used henceforth in this country for nine centuries; and is, indeed, practically the same Liturgy which is now used by Roman Catholics in the archdiocese of Westminster and all over England. This would seem to imply that Continuity in Roman Doctrine can be traced back from very early times indeed. My second remark is that, at the period of the Augustine mission, the Pontifical sway of St. Gregory the Great was almost world-wide. Indeed this sway was so asserted and so admitted that St. Gregory could mark out dioceses, prescribe synods, receive appeals, revise judgments, depose bishops, judge of faith, and require of all men that they should refer

difficult questions to him. And this too at the close of the sixth century. I apprehend, therefore, that Continuity may rather be traced from St. Gregory the Great than from those few half-savage Britons who, driven wild by ferocious enmity, showed a not very amiable temper toward St. Augustine.

The Rev. Sebastian Stole (who was disappointed with Professor Mildmay). It seems to me that you would ignore the historic fact that, all down the middle ages, the governments of this country were in constant warfare with the ambitious bishops of Rome—with their Pontifical pretensions and exactions. Continuity must stand or fall by that fact.

Professor Mildmay. I should be grieved if you could suppose for a moment that I ignored any fact or any argument. It would be impossible to question the accuracy of your assertion that such conflicts were frequent, almost continuous. Yet may I respectfully suggest that these conflicts, without exception, referred only to the frontier-line of Two Powers, the Powers of the Spirituality and the Temporality? Such words as Appeals, Prohibitions,

Provisors, Præmunire, point to conflicts between Sovereigns and Popes, *not* as to the Pope's power in spiritual matters, but as to the "mixed causes," which were half-spiritual, half-temporal. In a recent pamphlet which was published by Lord Selborne, there is an effort to prove that these contests in the middle ages showed the rejection of the Pontifical power by English sovereigns. Toward the end of that pamphlet Lord Selborne confesses that he has been arguing from an Anglican point of view; or, as he expresses it, "All that has been said represents of course an English, not the Roman point of view." And again he says, "It is necessarily from the English point of view that this controversy must be conducted." Now it is perfectly natural that an eminent judge should look at history as both prosecutor and defendant in vexed questions; yet I cannot help thinking of Mr. Froude's saying, "It seems to me that history is like a child's box of letters, with which we can spell any word we please." In the present case the "box of letters" is a thousand years of the correlation of the Spiritual and the Regal

Powers in this country; and strange indeed would it have been if, in that long period, there had not been kings who were more worldly than they were Christian. The Church Militant necessarily implies the World Militant. May I be permitted, however, to express this view of the vexed question: that English kings, in always *submitting* to the Papal authority, spite of their sometimes resisting it for a long period, proved that the faith of the English nation was Roman Catholic; that "Continuity" was always regarded as Pontifical? Take two of the most well-known illustrations: the contest of St. Thomas à Becket with Henry II., and that of Stephen Langdon with King John. In both cases the Pope was on the side of the archbishop, and the archbishop acted solely on the Pope's authority. Now how did these two contests end? In the first case, Henry II. had to stand in Canterbury Cathedral, with his hand on the Book of the Gospels on the high altar, and to swear to abolish all customs contrary to the liberty of the Church, and to do penance for his share in the archbishop's murder. In the second case, King John had to

stand in the open air, outside the west door of the same cathedral, and to swear to abolish all the "new customs," and to restore the ecclesiastical laws of St. Edward. Now *why* did these two tyrants consent to do this? How came it to pass that two imperious monarchs, full of pride and purely worldly ambition, had to humble themselves before their subjects and to do public penance, as though they were ordinary profligates or malefactors? I can only think of one answer, and it is this: it was because all England was so intensely Roman Catholic that no king dared to incur the Pope's anathema; in other words, it was because the national sense of Continuity was in harmony with that of the bishops and the Supreme Pontiff; "*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*," being the sum of the Continuity of English Catholics.

The President. Do I understand you to convey that every one of the English kings assented to the spiritual claims of the Roman Pontiffs; that there was only, from time to time, a perfectly natural friction in regard to the frontiers of the Two Powers—a friction which from the nature of things was unavoid-

able; and which is even manifest in the present day, under altered conditions, wherever the State and the Church dispute their boundaries?

Professor Mildmay. I should say so. From the time of William the Conqueror—wilful prince that he was—who wrote to Pope Gregory VII. that he "would pay the Peter's Pence because *all* his predecessors had done so;" to the time, say, of Edward II., who wrote to the Sacred College that "by an unchangeable ordinance Christ gave the charge of His Church to the Apostle St. Peter, and in his person to his successors, the Roman Pontiffs;" and so on, right down to Henry VIII.; there seems to have been one harmonious acknowledgment of the Spiritual Supremacy of the Popes.

Pastor Dort. There is one point on which I cannot suffer the learned professor to run away with these Roman Catholic ideas. For myself I should boldly affirm that, had it not been for the "Forged Decretals," all this power of the Roman Pontiffs would not have been heard of. The Anglican claimants to Continuity may

well point to *them* as being the instrument of the new change in the old faith. I agree with Lord Selborne that the Forged Decretals were the main source of the Continuity of rank Popery all over Christendom. I take the side of that learned Lord Chancellor, in considering that, had it not been for the Forged Decretals, Popery might have been comparatively harmless.

Professor Mildmay. I always thought that view so perfectly natural. *Prima facie* I should justify your inference. If I do not quite do so, it is upon grounds which you will, I hope, acknowledge to be substantial—to be at least sufficiently statistical to have weight. And first may I say to you: As the Forged Decretals had no existence for two hundred and fifty years after the time of St. Gregory the Great, I do not see how your reasoning can apply. The date of the Decretals was 845–857. The date of St. Augustine's mission was 596. And it is admitted by the majority of historians that, as they express it, "the power of the Popes had been built up" before the conversion of England by St. Augustine.

How, then, could those Decretals affect that power?

Pastor Dort. In the very fact that the assertion of such colossal power was forged we can trace the purpose of the forger to promote that power.

The Professor. That is so true. Yet you are, I am sure, aware that a great part of these Decretals were not forgeries, but quotations from real documents? They were very largely transcripts of authenticated writings, referred, however, to periods they did not belong to. Sometimes the periods would be made earlier, sometimes they would be made later, than the periods in which they actually appeared. The purpose of the forgery seems to have been to protect the French bishops from local interference or dictation, and their origin was unquestionably French. But there are two points to which I would draw your attention, and which I think must have weight in the controversy. The first point is that there is not a single prerogative of the Roman Pontiff insisted upon throughout the whole of the Forged Decretals which was not recognized

as the common law of the Christian Church. This being so, it is not curious that none of the Popes used the Forged Decretals to "build up" their power or supremacy. The very Popes who are assumed to have been so ambitious during the period following the discovery of the Decretals declined to recognize their genuineness or authenticity. Pope St. Nicholas did not make any use of them, nor did Adrian II., nor did John VIII., nor did Stephen—save in one passage, in which he shows by the context that he did not attach any value to them. And when it is added—and this is my second point—that no surprise was felt throughout Christendom (so far as Christendom could be said to hear of the matter) at anything that was contained in these Decretals—for the simple reason that there was nothing new in their ruling—it is not too much to say that these Decretals are a grand witness to the faith of the early Christians throughout Europe—to the belief that "Continuity" was inexorably Pontifical, essentially bound up with the Papal Power.

I will draw a parallel by way of illustrating my meaning. If in this year, 1893, a won-

drous manuscript were to be brought to light, in which very great authorities were made to affirm that the English government had been monarchical since the time of the battle of Hastings, the manuscript would not attract much attention. It was precisely the same with the Forged Decretals. They did not contain anything that was not known as to doctrine, or government, or discipline. They were, therefore, always treated as a curiosity, or at the best as an unauthorized collection; no one for a long while being able to name the compiler, and no Pope ever giving them his guarantee.

Pastor Dort (who seemed to be half-amused and half-irritated). I take it that the gist of your general pleading might be very fairly summarized in this way: that it is the *making* of history, or the *mis-reading* of history, which is responsible for popular misapprehension?

Professor Mildmay. It is not the fault of the readers but of the writers. With the exception of Hallam, I do not know any English historian who can be said to have written his-

tory without a text. Indeed the text is the only apology for the history. Take that wondrously eloquent chapter by Lord Macaulay on the life and character of his hero, William of Orange. The text is, "Blessed was the Protestant Ascendancy;" and the sermon is, "See how this hero of the Ascendancy was without flaw in his conduct or his morals." Mr. Froude's idea of history as being "a child's box of letters" is justified by most essayists and controversialists; and the reason is that history is loved more for its aid in special pleading than for its testimony to what we do not wish to be true.

(Professor Mildmay resuming his seat, there was a lull, indeed a silence, for a few moments. The President, however, wisely broke the silence by a suggestion which was appropriate and interesting.)

The President. I am surprised that, while discussing "Continuity," no one has said a word about "Catholicity." I had thought that the two subjects must go together. Indeed I have heard it argued by High Churchmen that Continuity and Catholicity are not

divisible; Continuity being the pledge of Catholicity, and Catholicity the pledge of Continuity. Now if Catholicity be twin with Continuity, it would be desirable that we should apprehend their mutual aid. May I ask you, gentlemen, to define for me the word "Catholic," so that we may arrive at some accord on this subject? I should like you, each one of you, to answer the question in turn, "What do you mean by the word Catholic?"

Canon Courtly. A Catholic, to my thinking, is a baptized soul, who believes in the fellowship of all good Christians.

Dr. Wylde. Catholic, in the modern sense, means comprehensive of all differences.

Rev. Walter Sterling. In *real* sense, I take Catholic to mean the union of all Christians in one common belief in the one Redeemer; in *historic* sense it means "Roman" Catholic; and in Anglican sense it means the union of Episcopalians, to the exclusion of Wesleyans and all wretched heretics. (Laughter.)

Mr. Moore. Catholics are those Christians who are agreed upon essentials; though un-

happily there is great variety of opinion as to the compass of what is essential to the Christian faith.

Captain Banner. Catholics are those Christians who have the *assurance* of their being saved.

Pastor Dort. I have always insisted that the word Catholic has two meanings: The union of all true Christians in scriptural truth, and their union in the rejection of Papal claims.

Rev. Sebastian Stole. The word Catholic means simply universal. Are we to understand the universality of error, or the universality of one baptism into one faith?

The President. The "one faith" is the very question at issue! If we could be all "Catholic in one faith" our Catholicity would indeed be magnificent.

Professor Mildmay. To be all Catholic in one faith would be impossible, unless there were an authority to decide on faith.

Pastor Dort. You are speaking now of an *imposed* faith, not of a faith which should be spontaneous and free. I have a very poor opinion of an imposed faith.

Professor Mildmay. Is faith, then, permit me to ask you, to be grounded on private judgment, or is it to be grounded on authority? Private judgment may be "free," but it is not trustworthy. In divine truths we want an authority which is divine.

The President. When you say "an authority which is divine," you mean, I suppose, a living, audible authority, a living, audible interpreter of Revelation?

Professor Mildmay. Yes. Without it the Catholicity of one faith would be an absolute impossibility in the human family.

Mr. Moore. Then, if I mistake not, you would advocate the principle of a living, audible *Head* of the Christian Church? I do not believe that the Christian Body called the Church has any need of a living, audible Head. To my thinking Catholicity is interior; not ostensible, corporate, ecclesiastical. We all believe in a *spiritual* body called the Church, whose Catholicity is not visible but interior.

Professor Mildmay. The word "spiritual," as it seems to me, may be made to hide practical disunion. In England alone there are

236 sects, each of which claims to define truths "spiritually." Yet to be spiritual a truth must be divine; to be divine it must be *one* unchangeable truth. To talk of "spiritual unity," when there is variety in doctrine, is as inaccurate as to talk of material unity when the component parts are at war by their very nature.

Rev. Walter Sterling (after a pause, and with some vehemence). Then what *is* the alone Christian unity?

(Some moments passed, but no one answered; when suddenly Mr. Armytage, to the great surprise of the Editor of these pages, rose quickly from his place beside the Editor; and before the Editor had time to pull him back into his seat, had begun to take part in the debate.)

Mr. Armytage. May I be permitted to attempt to answer the question just proposed: "What *is* the alone Christian unity?"

The President, and the other gentlemen on the platform, appeared for the moment to be perplexed; but they very politely conceded to Mr. Armytage the privilege of offering his

opinion. He therefore answered Mr. Sterling as follows:

The "alone Christian unity" for which the reverend gentleman seeks is the union of all the members of one body with the one head of that body; a union of the same faith, the same sacraments, the same worship; and therefore the union of the Church on earth with the Church in heaven—the realization of the Catholic Communion of Saints. Here then we have also the true idea of "Catholicity," of which the delegates have just suggested various meanings. Catholicity is not the union of differences, but the union of most absolute identities. From the Supreme Pontiff to the child at his First Communion, there is one mind on every point that is of faith. This is why it has been said that "Catholicity is ecclesiastical beauty; and beauty is balance and proportion." But what beauty, what balance or proportion, can be found in the hideous progeny of heresy? Your Church of England has utterly repudiated Catholicity; and so insensible is she to the duty of desiring it that she can make her sovereigns swear, on their

coronation day, to maintain—*not* the beauty of Catholicity, not its balance or proportion, but—"the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law." Yes, *law* is your insular notion of Catholicity. As Lord Chief Justice Coleridge has well put it: "The Established Church is a political institution, established, created, and protected by law, absolutely dependant on Parliament:" an excellent summary of the famous statutes of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, which established "the Supremacy of the Crown over spiritual men and causes." And, gentlemen, now that I am speaking to you on Authority, I will recall to you a correlative point, Jurisdiction. Permit me to say to you that, as is your Spiritual Authority, so also is your Spiritual Jurisdiction. Acts of Parliament are the sole fountain of your Jurisdiction, as they are the sole fountain of your whole spiritual Government. I could not help wondering, when you were discussing Catholicity, why not one of you said a word about jurisdiction. Yet jurisdiction is an integral part of Catholicity, for both have their pledge in Supreme Authority. Suffer

me to say a word on this subject; it is so conclusive as to your *want* of Catholicity. What jurisdiction have your Anglican bishops and archbishops? They have just so much jurisdiction as a Prime Minister can give them—that is, they have no jurisdiction at all. They have the same jurisdiction as a Postmaster General—derived from exactly the same source. May I be pardoned if I illustrate this grave travesty of jurisdiction from an incident in the life of Lord Beaconsfield? He was walking in London with a Member of Parliament, when an Anglican bishop saluted him profoundly—with an obeisance which could only be interpreted as meaning, "I recognize that you are my superior." Lord Beaconsfield turned laughingly to his friend and said, "I made him a bishop, but I forget his name." Yes, Lord Beaconsfield had given him all the Catholic jurisdiction which the author of brilliant novels could impart to him out of the plenitude of his romantic apostolicity. But this is your misfortune, reverend gentlemen, that you must ally divine authority with State offices, because you have denied divine authority to the

COLLEG
OAKLAND, C

Holy See. This inversion is a necessity of your Protestantism. It has been the necessity of Anglican Protestantism in all periods. I am reminded of a saying of Francis I., King of France, in the time of the arch-rebel, Henry VIII. "The King of England," said the French King, "gives dispensations like His Holiness; and I believe he will soon want to say Mass." Why not? you may well ask; why should not Henry VIII. have said Mass? If the Temporal Power can create spiritual jurisdiction, why should it not exercise priestly functions? *O quod ludibrium de Ecclesia facis.* What a conception Anglicans have of a Divine Church! What a conception Anglicans have of Almighty God! As the late Lord Tennyson said with perfectly pardonable sarcasm: "The great majority of Englishmen look upon Almighty God as an immeasurable clergyman in a white tie."

(Mr. Armytage was on the point of resuming his seat, when the Delegate for the Home-Made Sects said to him:)

Mr. Moore. You, sir, believe in a *visible* Church, with its *visible* integrity or unity, and

with its *visible* Head, the Supreme Pontiff. Dissenters believe only in the invisible body of redeemed souls, and in the invisible Divine Head who is in Heaven.

Mr. Armytage. Your clergy are visible, your congresses are visible, quite as visible as are the clergy and congresses of the Church of England. If, then, you admit the *principle* of visible authority, why not carry out that principle in its entirety, and believe also in a Visible Head?

(No answer being given, Mr. Armytage proceeded:) Who ever heard of a body without a head to it? Decapitation is usually regarded as capital punishment; yet all non-Catholics have made it the supreme method of imparting life to that "Second Incarnation," the Church of God. Is not this the very superlative of irrationalism? Does it not contradict all we see and know? Did you ever hear of a tree without a root? Did you ever hear of a circle without a centre? Did you ever hear of a stream without a source, of a disciple without a master, of a family which had never acknowledged any father? Did you ever hear of an army which had no Commander-in-Chief,

or of a navy of which the ship's crews had the supreme power? And if in human matters, where perhaps many men are wise men, there is the confessed impossibility of fruitful union unless one man take the lead and be obeyed, how much more in spiritual matters, which are beyond all human judgment, must a right faith depend on a right authority? Has not God shown you, by the myriad divisions of Protestant heresies, that man, as his own teacher, must get wrong? Look at England, which for three centuries has been schismatical. See the awful state of internecine quarrelling all over the kingdom; clergy and laity, men, women, and children being like autumn leaves blown about by a high wind; more than two hundred religious sects turning their weapons against each other; Christian men, ay, and Christian women, declaiming in drawing-rooms, on public platforms, in wayside taverns, against sacraments, against authority, against obedience; perverting history, perverting fact, perverting doctrine in their resolute determination to obey themselves; seeking for pretexts for their life-long evasion of holy

faith; and going down to their graves with no more knowledge of Catholic philosophy than captious books or mercenary newspapers can give them. Gentlemen, you have to-day been seeking for unity. You have been proposing to unite the Church of England with the infinitely varying sects of Non-Conformism. But what said Cardinal Newman fifty years ago, when he was struggling to find his way into Catholic unity: "We cannot hope for the recovery of Dissenting bodies while we ourselves are alienated from the great body of Christendom. We cannot hope for unity of faith, if we at our own private will make a faith for ourselves in this one small corner of the earth." And how applicable are these words to the present hour—to this Council which has met to-day to seek for unity! For unity and Catholicity are the same thing; and so are Catholicity and Continuity. I pray you, gentlemen, to unite yourselves with the Supreme Head of Christendom, that so you may have Unity, Catholicity, Continuity.

(And having delivered himself of this fervid oration, Mr. Armytage resumed his place be-

side the Editor; and the gentlemen on the platform seemed diverted and also pleased that a stranger had broken in upon their dignity. The President merely remarked very amiably:)

The President. We must have all enjoyed the enthusiasm of the last speaker. He at least made it plain that, in the Roman Catholic sense, Catholicity depends on union with the Holy See. I should have liked him, however, before he sat down, to have attempted an answer to the main question: "Is it not possible to regard Catholic Continuity as a heritage of the Anglo-Catholic Church?"

Mr. Armytage (who rose eagerly in response). No, sir, it is on all grounds impossible. On the ground of Holy Orders, on the ground of jurisdiction, on the ground of faith, worship, devotion, it is impracticable to the point of absurdity. The modern High Churchmen, enthroning themselves on their insularism, look the Catholic Church in the face and say: "*You* are in error. *We* alone are the supreme arbiters of Catholic truth. *We* alone are the true heirs of the Primitive Church. *Our* infallibility extends to the judgment of our own Church,

of the Middle Ages, and, of course, specially and radically, of the Holy See; and *we*, in the plenitude of our apostolic wisdom, pronounce ourselves to be continuous—not from *you*, not from the Middle Ages, not from the faith of the canonized saints of a dozen centuries, but from that infallibility which died out before Augustine, to be renewed only by Dr. Pusey and Dr. Littledale, and a few other chosen spirits of modern Anglicanism.

No, I must ask to be excused from grave argument, for it is difficult to be grave about such sophistry. I cannot turn my intellect upside down. I cannot trace Continuity from exact opposites—Continuity of disobedience from obedience; of personal, individual infallibility from the infallibility of the undivided Catholic Church; of the spiritual headship of Queen Victoria, of her parliaments and privy councils, from that of the Supreme Pontificate of St. Peter; of a parliamentary form of divine service from the Sacrifice of the Mass; of irreverence to the Blessed Virgin from devotion to her; of two mutilated sacraments from the perfect Seven; of a married clergy from an

unmarried priesthood; of no confession from habitual confession; of the laying on of hands by a respectable married gentleman from a consecration which included the anointing the hands of the candidates by holy chrism, the delivering to them the chalice and the paten, and the celebration of the Sacrifice of the Mass conjointly with the bishop who ordained them; of a hundred different religious "views" or "theologies" from one and the same faith in all ages; of the Thirty-nine Articles from General Councils; of the Canterbury of to-day from the Canterbury of St. Augustine or St. Thomas; of the modern Westminster Abbey from the Abbey of the Confessor; or of the comfortable domestic closes of the Cathedrals from the ascetic homes of Benedictines or Dominicans; of one incessant roar of doctrinal strife and newspaper theologies from the still, small voice of the Holy Spirit of God, directing all intellects to know and believe the same truths, while leaving them free to question everything that was not of faith; of—but I may, I think, sum it all up in one word, the Continuity of the human from the divine.

Common sense is the only theologian that is wanted. Not until chaos can be continuity of divine order, or exact contraries continuity of identities, can the Church of England establish her claim to Catholic unity with the one holy, undivided Church of Christ.

(And now there began a general movement in the hall, with an obvious sense that there was little more to be said. The President entered familiarly into conversation with the delegates, and with the other gentlemen who had been invited to the platform. Mr. Armytage, after his warm spasmodic effort, was only too happy to make his escape into fresh air; but perhaps the Editor of these pages was the most rejoiced of all the company, because his laborious day's work was completed.)

Printed by Benziger Brothers, New York.

STANDARD WORKS.

Christ in Type and Prophecy. By Rev. A. J. MAAS, S.J., Professor of Oriental Languages at Woodstock College. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $2.00.

"This is a very scholarly work, and apparently exhaustive of the subject, if one may judge by the extensive researches of the author, who seems to have ransacked the entire domain of prophetical literature in quest of information to be found among the most eminent interpreters of prophecy, and consulting the most prominent exegetical writers of all theological schools in Europe and America. . . . His delineation of the prophecies of the Old Testament as they relate to the coming Messiah, and the wonderful fulfilment of these prophecies as they centre in the Messiah, are indeed as beautiful as they are convincing. . . ." —*Christian Leader.*

Christian Anthropology. By Rev. JOHN THEIN. With an Introduction by Prof. CHAS. G. HERBERMANN, LL.D. 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2.50.

". . . We do not know of any other work in which the evidences from the Christian standpoint are so well massed, the points so clearly brought out, and the field of controversy so fully covered. It is a book which every student of Catholic philosophy and theology should master. . . ."—*Rev. G. B. Brady, C.S.P., in Catholic World.*

"It is a practical, careful study of its included themes, and is written simply and well. The author is conservative in his positions, though open to new light, and such a work as his should have a wide and useful influence."—*The Congregationalist.*

God Knowable and Known. By Rev. MAURICE RONAYNE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.25.

". . . It treats the argument in an elevated and dispassionate way, giving in clear, logical, and devout setting the general array of reasons to which all theistic thinkers agree. These reasons are presented with strength and attractiveness. . . ."—*Public Opinion.*

". . . The whole subject is indeed a difficult one. We incline to think that this is on the whole the most popular treatment of it which has appeared anywhere in English."—*The Tablet.*

BENZIGER BROTHERS, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

Manuals of Catholic Philosophy.

1. **Logic.** By R. F. CLARKE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.25.

"An excellent text-book of Aristotelian logic, interesting, vivid, sometimes almost racy in its illustrations, while from first to last it never, so far as we have noticed, diverges from Aristotelian orthodoxy."—*Guardian* (London).

2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.25.

"The burden of Mr. Rickaby's utterance is that Idealism is wrong and Realism is right; that Idealism is a mere blind, concealing a general skepticism as to the possibility of truth at all, whereas Realism alone will explain the facts of knowledge, and strengthen a man's conviction of the validity of his rational processes."—*Church Quarterly.*

3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.25.

"The arrangement is methodical, and the style clear and condensed. . . . The work is a new and important departure, and deserves to be read by others than those for whom it is primarily intended."—*Scottish Review.*

4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.50.

"The author is evidently well acquainted with Mill, Spencer, Huxley, and other contemporary writers; they are quoted freely, and clearly answered."—*Dublin Review.*

5. **Psychology.** By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.50.

"It is distinguished in an equal degree by lucidity of treatment, and by the thorough mastery which it shows, not only of the subject itself, but also of the history of psychological speculation and of the opinions of men of the most diverse schools of thought."—*The Month.*

6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.25.

"If such a thing were possible, we would like to see this book in the hands of every thinking man in the land."—*Am. Cath. Quarterly Review.*

BENZIGER BROTHERS, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

Manuals of Catholic Philosophy.—*Continued.*

7. **A Manual of Political Economy.** By C S. DEVAS, Esq., M.A., Examiner in Economy in the Royal University of Ireland. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.50.

"Will be found a valuable manual, both by collegiates and by individual students. The author gives special consideration to those problems to which attention is at present most directly attracted."—*The Pilot.*

A Catholic Dictionary. Containing Some Account of the Doctrine, Discipline, Rites, Ceremonies, Councils, and Religious Orders of the Catholic Church. By WILLIAM E. ADDIS, sometime Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland, and THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A., Fellow of the same University. New edition, entirely reset, revised and enlarged with the assistance of Rev. T. B. SCANNELL, B.D. Large 8vo, cloth, *net*, $5.00.

". . . It is the only book that we know of that can be called a trustworthy source of information on Catholic doctrine. . . . It would be well if many Protestants who make statements that the Roman Catholics can easily disprove, would possess this book, and consult it for authoritative utterances. . . ."—*Christian Advocate.*

". . . There are few subjects connected with the Church that a man can inquire about on which it will not give him the information he seeks, or put him on the way to finding it. It is certainly a book which no Catholic library, or, for that matter, no library of any pretensions, Catholic or otherwise, can henceforth afford to be without."—*The Pilot.*

Principles of Anthropology and Biology. By Rev. THOMAS HUGHES, S.J. Second edition. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

"The book sustains a high degree of merit throughout; perhaps the most valuable and interesting parts being the account of prehistoric man, and the comparison of the Mosaic record of creation with geology. It is written in excellent English, and at the same time with that sharpness and distinctness which characterize good American scientific works."—*Dublin Review.*

". . . We heartily recommend this work to all who seek to know the real value of recent scientific theories regarding its subject-matter, when tested by common sense and sound logic. . . ."—*American Ecclesiastical Review.*

Socialism Exposed and Refuted. By Rev. VICTOR CATHREIN, S.J. A Chapter from the author's Moral Philosophy. From the German. By Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

"It is thus a valuable epitome of its subject, apart from its attempt to refute socialistic argument. The author goes back to Lycurgus and Plato for ancient socialism and to Aristotle for its refutation, and of modern he alleges that it emphasizes unduly industrial life, the materialistic view of life, and the idea of equal rights. . . . In many other ways also the impracticability of socialistic theories is argued with acuteness and force."—*Brooklyn Daily Eagle.*

Literary, Scientific, and Political Views of ORESTES A. BROWNSON. Selected from his works, by H. F. BROWNSON. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.25.

"This is a much-needed book. The wisdom and learning of Brownson are needed at the present day. . . . The little volume contains the very best thoughts of the great reviewer, and the selections are made with special reference to the needs of our own times. To read some of these extracts is like casting an anchor to windward during a tempest. . . ."—*New World.*

"Brownson was a strong man, and when one once fell into the current of his argument he was very sure to be swept on with him to the end. . . . There is a sturdy ethical strength in his thinking and writing which makes it good reading."—*The Independent.*

Words of Wisdom. A Concordance of the Sapiential Books. Edited by Rev. JOHN J. BELL. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1.25.

The aim of the work is to distribute under various titles the holy and practical maxims contained in the Sapiential Books, to form of them a moral code of Christian conduct. The book will be particularly serviceable for clergymen, who will find an abundance of texts judiciously arranged.

"How much there is in good editing may be gathered from the Rev. John J. Bell's 'Words of Wisdom from the Scriptures.' Detached passages of Holy Writ are arranged with such excellent judgment that each chapter seems to have been originally written in its present order. The work is a valuable selection from the inspired authors."—*Ave Maria.*

BENZIGER BROTHERS, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

REV. JAMES A. GRANT BEQUEST TO
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE LIBRARY, 1925

A Commentary on the Holy Gospels. In 4 Vols. By JOHN MALDONATUS, S.J. Translated and Edited from the original Latin by GEORGE J. DAVIE, M.A., Exeter College, Oxford, one of the Translators of the Library of the Fathers. Vols. I. and II. (*St. Matthew's Gospel.*) Cloth, per vol., *net*, $3.00.

"The Commentary is certainly one with which a Biblical student should make himself acquainted."—*Guardian.*

The Complete Works of St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux. Translated into English from the edition of DOM JOANNES MABILLON, of the Benedictine Congregation of St. Maur (1690), and Edited by SAMUEL J. EALES, D.C.L., sometime Principal of St. Boniface College, Warminster. Vols. I. and II. containing the Letters of St. Bernard. *Vols. III. and IV. in the Press.* Cloth, per vol., *net*, $3.00.

The Hierurgia; or, The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. With Notes and Dissertations elucidating its Doctrines and Ceremonies. By Dr. DANIEL ROCK. A New and thoroughly Revised Edition, with many Illustrations. Edited, with a Preface, by W. H. JAMES WEALE. 2 vols., cloth, *net*, $6.00.

The Ministry of Preaching. An Essay on Pastoral and Popular Oratory. By Mgr. FELIX DUPANLOUP, Bishop of Orleans, Member of the French Academy. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged, with Portrait. Cloth, *net*, $1.25.

The Ministry of Catechising. By Monseigneur DUPANLOUP, Bishop of Orleans, Member of the French Academy. Translated into English. With a Portrait of the Author. Cloth, *net*, $2.00.

Aquinas Ethicus; or, The Moral Teaching of St. Thomas. A translation of the principal portions of the second part of the *Summa Theologica*, with Notes. By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. 2 vols., cloth, *net*, $4.00.

". . . Father Rickaby's work is, in our opinion, the most valuable addition made in our times to ethical English literature. Modern authors, even the famous among them, will be amazed to find what a treasury the Church has, unknown to them, possessed for centuries in the magnificent 'Summa' of St. Thomas Aquinas, which splendid work Father Rickaby has made known to the great English-speaking world. . ."—*Am. Cath. Quarterly Review.*

BENZIGER BROTHERS, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

The Great Commentary on the Gospels of Cornelius a Lapide. Translated and Edited by the Rev. T. W. Mossman, D.D. (B.A. Oxon.), assisted by various scholars. 6 vols., cloth, *net*, $18.00.

SS. Matthew and Mark's Gospels. 3 Vols.
S. John's Gospel and Three Epistles. 2 Vols.
S. Luke's Gospel. 1 Vol.

"It would indeed be gilding the finest gold to bestow praise on the great Commentary of à Lapide. It is a work of unequalled—we should say unapproached—value."—*John Bull.*

Piconio (Bernardine à). Exposition on St. Paul's Epistles. Translated and Edited by A. H. Prichard, B.A., Merton College, Oxford. 3 vols., cloth, *net*, $9.00.

"We desire to recommend this book to all. Of course to the priesthood any commendation is unnecessary; but among the laity there are many souls one of whose greatest drawbacks in the spiritual life is unfamiliarity with the Word of God."

—*Catholic World.*

The Dark Ages. A Series of Essays illustrating the State of Religion and Literature in the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Centuries. By the late Dr. Maitland, Keeper of the MSS. at Lambeth. Fifth Edition, with an Introduction by Frederick Stokes, M.A. Cloth, *net*, $3.00.

"No task could be more worthy of a scholar and divine so eminently distinguished as the author of this volume than a vindication of institutions which had been misrepresented for centuries, and a defence of men who had been maligned by those to whom they had been generous benefactors. We have read this work both with pleasure and profit."—*Athenæum.*

The History of the Popes, from the close of the Middle Ages. Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Vatican and other Original Sources. By Dr. L. Pastor, Professor of History in the University of Innsbruck. Translated from the German and Edited by Frederick Antrobus, of the London Oratory. Vols. I. to IV., cloth, per vol., *net*, $3.00.

"It is no exaggeration to say that this work is one of the most important historical studies of the present century."

—*Tablet.*

STANDARD CATHOLIC BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

BENZIGER BROTHERS,

CINCINNATI: 143 Main St. | NEW YORK: 36 & 38 BARCLAY ST. | CHICAGO: 178 Monroe St.

A MOST LIBERAL DISCOUNT from these Prices (those marked *net* excepted) will be made to Dealers, Clergymen, Religious Institutions, and Schools.
The Postage on *net* books is extra.

Abandonment; or, Absolute Surrender of Self to Divine Providence. By Rev. J. P. CAUSSADE, S.J. Translated by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Aletheia; or, The Outspoken Truth on the All-important Question of Divine Authoritative Teaching. An exposition of the Catholic Rule of Faith, contrasted with the various Theories of Private and Fallible Interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures. By the Right Rev. J. D. RICARDS, D.D. Second edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 80 cents.

Almanac, Catholic Home. A charming Annual for Catholics, 25 cts.

Analysis of the Gospels of the Sundays of the Year. From the Italian of Angelo Cagnola. By Rev. L. A. LAMBERT, LL.D., Author of "Notes on Ingersoll," etc. 8vo, cloth, *net*, 1 25

Art of Profiting by our Faults, according to St. Francis de Sales. From the French of Rev. J. TISSOT, by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Bible, The Holy. With Annotations, References, and an Historical and Chronological Index. 12mo, cloth, $1 25
Imitation morocco $3 00
Calf, round corners, red and gold edges 5 00
Morocco, " " " " 6 00
Divinity morocco, calf lined, sewed with silk *net*, 12 75
This is a handy edition, printed from clear, new type on good paper, substantially bound, at low prices.

Birthday Souvenir, or Diary. With a Subject of Meditation or a Prayer for every Day in the Year. By Mrs. A. E. BUCHANAN. New edition, with ruled pages for memoranda. Cloth, gilt, 50 cents.

Blessed Ones of 1888: Bl. Clement Maria Hofbauer, C.SS.R; Bl. Louis-Marie Grignon de Montfort; Bl. Brother Ægidius Mary of St. Joseph; Bl. Josephine Mary of St. Agnes. From the German by ELIZA A. DONNELLY. 18mo, cloth, illustrated, 50 cents.

Blind Friend of the Poor; Reminiscences of the Life and Works of Mgr. de SEGUR. 18mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Brownson, Orestes A., Literary, Scientific, and Political Views of. Selected from his works, by H. F. BROWNSON. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25

Burke, Rev. J. J. The Reasonableness of the Practices of the Catholic Church. 12mo, paper, 20 cents.

—— **The Reasonableness of the Ceremonies** of the Catholic Church. 12mo, paper, 10 cents.

Canonical Procedure in Disciplinary and Criminal Cases of Clerics. A systematic Commentary on the "Instructio S. C. Epp. et Reg. 1880." By the Rev. FRANCIS DROSTE. Edited by the Right Rev. SEBASTIAN G. MESSMER, D.D., Bishop of Green Bay, Wis. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 50

Catechism of Familiar Things. Their History, and the Events which led to their Discovery. With a short explanation of some of the principal Natural Phenomena. With 16 full-page Illustrations. Cloth, inked side, $1 00

Catechism of Perseverance; or, An Historical, Dogmatic, Moral, Liturgical, Apologetical, Philosophical, and Social Exposition of Religion from the beginning of the World down to our own days. By Mgr. GAUME. From the 10th French edition. 4 vols., *net*, $7 50

Catholic Belief; or, a Short and Simple Exposition of Catholic Doctrine. By the Very Rev. JOSEPH FAÁ DI BRUNO, D.D. Author's American edition edited by Rev. LOUIS A. LAMBERT, author of "Notes on Ingersoll," etc. 100th Thousand. 16mo, flexible cloth, 40 cents. 10 copies, $2.65—50 copies, $12.00—100 copies, $20 00
Cloth, red edges, 75 cents.

Catholic Christianity and Modern Unbelief. A plain and brief statement of the real doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church as opposed to those falsely attributed to her by unbelievers in Revelation. By the Right Rev. J. D. RICARDS, D.D. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

Catholic Memoirs of Vermont and New Hampshire. With sketches of the lives of Rev. Wm. Henry Hoyt and Fanny Allen. Also with accounts heretofore unpublished of the lives of Rev. Daniel Barber, Rev. Horace Barber, S.J., and Jerusha Barber. 12mo, cloth, ink and gold side, $1 00
Paper, 50 cents.

Catholic Worship. The Sacraments, Ceremonies, and Festivals of the Church explained in Questions and Answers. From the German of Rev. O. GISLER, by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. (25th Thousand.) Paper, 15 cents; per 100, $9.00. Cloth, 25 cents; per 100, $15.00.

Catholic Young Man of the Present Day. Letters to a Young Man by Right Rev. AUGUSTINE EGGER, D.D., Bishop of St. Gall. From the German, by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 32mo, paper, 15 cents; per 100, $9.00. Cloth, inked sides, 25 cents; per 100, $15.00.

Christ on the Altar. Instructions for the Sundays and Festivals of the Ecclesiastical Year. Explaining how the Life, Miracles, and Teachings of Our Lord in the Holy Land are continued on the Altar of the Parish Church. By Right Rev. LOUIS DE GOESBRIAND, D.D., Bishop of Burlington, Vt. With 2 chromo-lithographs, 63 full-page illustrations, 240 illustrations of the Holy Land and of Bible History, ornamental initials, tail-pieces, etc., etc. Quarto, cloth, rich gold and ink design, gilt edges, $6 00

Christian Anthropology. By Rev. JOHN THEIN. With an Introduction by Prof. CHAS. G. HERBERMANN, LL.D. 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 50

Christian Father, The; what he should be, and what he should do. Together with a Collection of Prayers suitable to his condition. (25th Thousand.) Paper, 25 cents; per 100, $15.00. Maroquette, 35 cents; per 100, $21.00. Cloth, 50 cents; per 100, $30.00.

Christian Mother, The; the Education of her Children and her Prayer. With an account of the Archconfraternity of Christian Mothers, together with its rules, prayers, indulgences, etc. (35th Thousand.) Paper, 25 cents; per 100, $15.00. Maroquette, 35 cents; per 100, $21.00. Cloth, 50 cents; per 100, $30.00.

Compendium Sacrae Liturgiae Juxta Ritum Romanum una cum Appendice De Jure Ecclesiastico Particulari in America Foederata Sept. vigente scripsit P. WAPELHORST, O.S.F. Crown, 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 50

Cornelius a Lapide's Great Commentary upon the Gospels. Translated and edited by the Rev. T. W. MOSSMANN, B.A., Oxon. Complete in six vols., *net*, $18 00

Correct Thing for Catholics, The. By LELIA HARDIN BUGG. *Sixth edition.* 16mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Counsels of a Catholic Mother to Her Daughter. Translated from the French. 18mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Counsels of St. Angela to Her Sisters in Religion. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 25 cents.

Crown of Thorns, The; or, The Little Breviary of the Holy Face. A complete Manual of Devotion and Reparation to the Holy Face of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Eucharistic Gems. A Thought about the Most Blessed Sacrament for Every Day in the Year. Compiled from the works of the Saints and other devout writers on this great Mystery. By Rev. L. C. COELENBIER. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 16mo, cloth, gilt sides, 75 cents.

Examination of Conscience for the use of Priests who are making a Retreat. From the French of GADUEL. Adapted by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.SS.R. Cloth, flexible, red edges, *net*, 30 cents.

Explanation of the Baltimore Catechism of Christian Doctrine. For the use of Sunday-school Teachers and Advanced Classes. By Rev. THOMAS L. KINKEAD. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

Fabiola; or, the Church of the Catacombs. By CARDINAL WISEMAN.
Illustrated Edition. Contains an exquisite, artistic Chromo-Frontispiece, 32 full-page Illustrations and numerous engravings. 4to, cloth, artistic design on side in gold and ink, red edges, $6 00
The same, gilt edges, $7 50

Finn, Rev. Francis J., S.J.

Tom Playfair; or, Making a Start. 12mo, cloth gilt. With a Frontispiece, $1 00

Percy Wynn; or, Making a Boy of Him. A Story of Boy Life at Boarding-School. With a Frontispiece. 12mo, cloth gilt, $1 00

Harry Dee; or, Making it Out. 12mo, cloth gilt. With a Frontispiece, $1 00

First Communicant's Manual. This book, prepared expressly for the use of those about to make their first Communion, contains a greater and richer collection of prayers and devotions relating to the Adorable Sacrament than any other prayer-book of its size. It is embellished with numerous full-page illustrations, head-bands, tail-pieces, and an illustrated Way of the Cross.
Red line edition. 32mo. Prices from 45 cents to $4.00.
Edition without red line. Small 32mo. Prices from 90 cents to $5.00

Francis de Sales, St.

Maxims and Counsels of. For Every Day of the Year. From the French by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
New Year Greetings. From the French by Miss MAGARET A. COLTON. 32mo, maroquette, full gilt side, 15 cents; per 100, $10 00

General Principles of the Religious Life. By Very Rev. BONIFACE F. VERHEYEN, O.S.B. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 30 cents.

Glories of Divine Grace. Translated from the German of Dr. M. JOS. SCHEEBEN, by a BENEDICTINE MONK of St. Meinrad's Abbey, Ind. Second, revised edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 50

God Knowable and Known. By Rev. MAURICE RONAYNE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25

Goffine's Devout Instructions on the Epistles and Gospels for the Sundays and Holidays; with Explanations of Christian Faith and Duty and of Church Ceremonies. With eight full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth, ink and gold side, $1 50

"Golden Sands," Books by the author of. Translated from the French by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. Each with a steel-plate Frontispiece.

Third Series, 32mo, cloth, 60 cents.
Fourth Series, 32mo, cloth, 60 cents.
Fifth Series, 32mo, cloth, 60 cents.
100 Persian calf, padded, gilt title and floral design, round corners, edges red under gold..... $1 20
127 German calf, limp, gilt centre, round corners, edges red under gold..... 1 80

Book of the Professed. 32mo, cloth.

Vol. I. } Each with a steel-plate Frontispiece. $1 00
Vol. II. } 0 75
Vol. III. } 0 75

Prayer. Offered to Novices and Pious People of the World. (Taken from the "Book of the Professed.") Cloth, 50 cents.

The Little Book of Superiors. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Spiritual Direction. For the use of Religious Communities. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Little Month of May. 32mo, maroquette, 25 cents.

Little Month of the Souls in Purgatory. With Prayers for the Suffering Souls, a Rosary, a Way of the Cross, and a Manner of Hearing Mass for the Souls in Purgatory. 32mo, black maroquette, 35 cents.

Hints on Letter Writing for Academies and for Self Instruction. 16mo, cloth, 60 cents.

Golden Prayer, The. Short Meditations on the Lord's Prayer for Every Day in the Week. With other Meditations on Prayer for Every Day in the Month. From the French of the ABBÉ DUQUESNE, by ANNE STUART BAILEY.

Paper, 10 cents; per 100, $6 00
Maroquette, 20 " " 12 00
The same, fine edition, with red line, cloth gilt, 50 cents.

Greetings to the Christ-Child. A Collection of Christmas Poems for the Young. Embellished with 9 Illustrations, Tail-pieces, etc., etc. Square 16mo, full gilt side, 50 cents.

Handbook for Altar Societies and Guide for Sacristans and others having charge of the Altar and Sanctuary. By a MEMBER OF AN ALTAR SOCIETY. 16mo, cloth, red edges, *net*, 75 cents.

Handbook of the Christian Religion. For the use of Advanced Students and the Educated Laity. By Rev. W. WILMERS, S.J. From the German. Edited by Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. Second edition, with supplement. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 50

Happy Year, A; or, the Year Sanctified by meditating on the Maxims and Sayings of the Saints. From the French of ABBÉ LASAUSSE, by Mrs. JAMES O'BRIEN. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

Heart, The, of St. Jane Frances de Chantal. Thoughts and Prayers compiled from the French by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. 32mo, cloth, with portrait of the Saint, 50 cents.

Hidden Treasure; or, The Value and Excellence of the Holy Mass. With a Practical and Devout Method of Hearing it with Profit. By the BLESSED LEONARD OF PORT-MAURICE. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

History of Confession; or, the Dogma of Confession Vindicated from the attacks of Heretics and Infidels. From the French of Rev. AMBROISE GUILLOIS, by Right Rev. LOUIS DE GOESBRIAND, D.D., Bishop of Burlington, Vt. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

History of the Catholic Church within the Limits of the United States, from the first attempted Colonization to the present time. By JOHN GILMARY SHEA. Bound in cloth, per volume, *net*, $5 00

Vol. I. **The Catholic Church in Colonial Days.**
Vol. II. **Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll.**
Vol. III. **From the Division of the Diocese of Baltimore to the Fifth Council of Baltimore, 1843.**
Vol. IV. **From the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1843, to the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1866.**

History of the Catholic Church, by Dr. H. BRUECK, with Additions from the Writings of His Eminence Cardinal Hergenröther. Translated by Rev. E. PRUENTE. With an Introduction by the Rt. Rev. J. A. CORCORAN, S.T.D. Second edition. 2 vols., 8vo, cloth, *net*, $3 00

History of the Catholic Church. Adapted from the original of Rev. L. C. BUSINGER, by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. Together with a **History of the Church in America,** by JOHN GILMARY SHEA, LL.D. With 90 Illustrations. 8vo, cloth, ink and gold side, $2 00

Holy Face of Jesus, The. A Series of Meditations on the Litany of the Holy Face. Adapted from the French of the Abbé J. B. FOURAULT, by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Home Rule Movement, with a Sketch of Irish Parties from 1843. By T. P. O'CONNOR, M.P. Large 8vo, 578 pages, cloth, $3 50

Hours Before the Altar; or, Meditations on the Holy Eucharist. By Mgr. DE LA BOUILLERIE. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

How They Worked Their Way, and other Tales. (Stories of Duty.) By M. F. EGAN, LL.D. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

How to Get On. By Rev. BERNARD FEENEY. With an Introduction by His Grace, the Most Rev. WM. H. GROSS, D.D., C.SS.R. 12mo, paper, 50 cents; cloth, $1 00

Hunolt's Sermons. Sermons by the Rev. FRANCIS HUNOLT, Priest of the Society of Jesus and Preacher in the Cathedral of Treves. Translated from the original German edition of Cologne, 1740, by the Rev. J. ALLEN, D.D., Chaplain of the Dominican Convent of the Sacred Heart, King Williamstown, South Africa.

The Sermons are adapted to all the Sundays and Holy-days of the Year, and each set contains a full index of all the sermons, an alphabetical index of the principal subjects treated, and copious marginal notes. Per set of 2 vols., *net*, $5 00

Vols. 1, 2. The Christian State of Life.
Vols. 3, 4. The Bad Christian.
Vols. 5, 6. The Penitent Christian.
Vols. 7, 8. The Good Christian.
Vols. 9, 10. The Christian's Last End. *In press.*
Vols. 11, 12. The Christian's Model. *In preparation.*

Idols; or, The Secret of the Rue Chaussée d'Antin. Translated from the French of RAOUL DE NAVERY, by Miss ANNA T. SADLIER. Second edition, revised. 12mo, cloth, $1 25

Instructions on the Commandments of God and the Sacraments of the Church. From the Italian of St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.SS.R. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents; maroquette, 35 cents.

Interior of Jesus and Mary. By Père Grou. New edition. Revised and edited by Rev. S. H. FRISBEE, S.J. 2 vols., 12mo, cloth, *net*, $2 00

Joseph, St., the Advocate of Hopeless Cases. From the French of Rev. Father HUGUET, Marist. 32mo, cloth, $1 00

Konings, Theologia Moralis. Novissimi Ecclesiæ Doctoris S. Alphonsi. In Compendium Redacta, et Usui Venerabilis Cleri Americani Accommodata, Auctore A. KONINGS, C.SS R. Editio septima, auctior, et novis curis expolitior, curante HENRICO KUPER, C.SS.R. Two vols., royal 8vo, half morocco, *net*, $5 00
The two vols. in one, half morocco, *net*, $ 400

Leper Queen, The. A Story of the Thirteenth Century. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Life and Acts of Leo XIII. Preceded by a sketch of the Last Days of Pius IX., and the Origin and Laws of the Conclave. New and enlarged edition. Compiled and translated from Authentic Sources, by Rev. JOSEPH E. KELLER, S.J. Fully and beautifully illustrated. Crown 8vo, cloth, full gilt side, $2 00

Life of St. Clare of Montefalco, Professed Nun of the Order of Hermits of St. Augustine. Translated by Rev. JOSEPH A. LOCKE, O.S.A. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

Life of St. Ignatius of Loyola. By Father Genelli, of the Society of Jesus. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 12mo, cloth, $1 50

Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and of His Blessed Mother. Translated and adapted from the original of Rev. L. C. BUSINGER by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. With nearly 600 choice Engravings.

No. 1. Roan back, gold title, plain cloth sides, sprinkled edges.....*net*, $5 00
No. 3. Morocco back and corners, cloth sides with gold stamp, gilt edges.*net*, 7 00
No. 4. Full morocco, richly gilt back, with large figure of Our Lord in gold on side, gilt edges.....*net*, 9 00
No. 5. Full morocco, block-panelled sides, superbly gilt, gilt edges.....*net*, 10 00

Life of Father Charles Sire, of the Society of Jesus. A Simple Biography compiled from his Writings and the Testimony of those who have known him best. By his brother, Rev. VITAL SIRE. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

Life of Father Jogues, Missionary Priest of the Society of Jesus. Slain by the Mohawk Iroquois, in the present State of New York, October 18, 1646. By Father FELIX MARTIN, S.J. With Father Jogues' Account of the Captivity and Death of his Companion, René Goupil, slain September 29, 1642. Translated from the French by JOHN GILMARY SHEA. Second, revised edition. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

Life of Mlle. Le Gras (Louise de Marillac), Foundress of the Sisters of Charity and Co-operator of St. Vincent de Paul. From the French by a SISTER OF CHARITY. 12mo, cloth, $1 50

Life of the Ven. Mary Crescentia Höss, of the Third Order of St. Francis. Drawn from the Acts of her Beatification and other reliable sources. 12mo, cloth, ink and gold side, $1 50

Life of St. Germaine Cousin, the Shepherd Maiden of Pibrac. From the French by a SISTER OF MERCY. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Life of St. Aloysius Gonzaga. From the Italian of Rev. Father CEPARI, S.J. With Original Notes and an Appendix. Edited by Rev. F. GOLDIE, S.J. With a chromo-lithographic portrait as frontispiece, phototype fac-simile of letter, 11 interleaved illustrations, and 108 other illustrations from historical documents, portraits, interiors, exteriors, plans, genealogical tables, etc. 8vo, cloth, beautifully bound, *net*, $2 50

Life of St. Francis di Geronimo of the Society of Jesus. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 75

Life of Right Rev. John N. Neumann, D.D., Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia. From the German of Rev. A. BERGER, C.SS.R., by Rev. EUG. GRIMM, C.SS.R. 12mo, cloth. With portrait, $1 50

Life of Mary for Children, The. From the German, by ANNE R. BENNETT, née GLADSTONE. Illustrated. 24mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

Life of Rev. Mother St. John Fontbonne, Foundress and First Superior-General of the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph in Lyons. From the French of ABBÉ RIVAUX. With a steel portrait, engraved expressly for this work. 12mo, cloth, $1 50

Life, Popular, of St. Teresa of Jesus. From the French of L'ABBÉ MARIE-JOSEPH, of the Order of Carmel, by ANNIE PORTER. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. Cloth, ink and gold side, $1 00

Liguori, St. Alphonsus de, Complete Ascetical Works of. Centenary Edition. Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.SS.R. This, the first complete, uniform edition in English of the works of this great Doctor of the Church will be in 24 volumes, of about 500 pages each, and offered at the uniform price, per volume, of *net*, $1 25

Each book is complete in itself, and any volume will be sold separately. Volumes 1 to 19 are now ready.

This edition of St. Alphonsus' Works has been honored with a letter from Our Holy Father Pope Leo XIII.

Linked Lives. By Lady GERTRUDE DOUGLASS. Crown 8vo, cloth, $1 50

Little Compliments of the Season. Simple Verses for Namedays, Birthdays, Christmas, New Year, and other festive and social occasions. With numerous and appropriate illustrations. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

Little Office of the Immaculate Conception, explained in Short Conferences. By Very Rev. JOSEPH RAINER. With Prayers. Suitable for Sodalities of the Blessed Virgin. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

Little Saint of Nine Years. A Biographical Notice. From the French of Mgr. DE SEGUR, by Miss MARY MCMAHON. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Lives, Short, of the Saints; or, Our Birthday Bouquet. Culled from the Shrines of the Saints and the Gardens of the Poets. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. Third edition. Cloth, gilt side, $1 00

Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States. By RICHARD H. CLARKE, LL.D. 3 vols., 8vo, cloth, per set, *net*, $7 50

Lourdes. Its Inhabitants, Its Pilgrims, Its Miracles. By R. F. CLARKE, S.J. Illustrated. 16mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Luther's Own Statements Concerning his Teachings and its Results. Taken exclusively from the earliest and best editions of his German and Latin Works. By HENRY O'CONNOR, S.J. 12mo, paper, 15 cents.

Manifestation of Conscience. Confessions and Communions in Religious Communities. A Commentary on the Decree "Quemadmodum" of December 17, 1890. From the French of Rev. Pie de Langogne, O.M. Cap. With the original Decree and the Official Translation. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

Manual of Indulgenced Prayers. A Complete Prayer-book. Arranged and disposed for daily use by Rev. BONAVENTURE HAMMER, O.S.F. (Prov. S. Joan. Bapt.) Small 32mo, cloth, inked sides, 40 cents.

Marriage. By Very Rev. PÈRE MONSABRÉ, O.P. From the French, by M. HOPPER. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

Martyr, A, of Our Own Times. Life of Rev. JUST DE BRETENIÈRES, Missionary Apostolic and Martyr in Corea. From the French of the Right Rev. Mgr. D'HULST, Rector of the Catholic Institute, Paris. Edited by Very Rev. J. R. SLATTERY. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

McCallen, Rev. James A., S.S.

Sanctuary Boy's Illustrated Manual. Embracing the Ceremonies of the Inferior Ministers at Low Mass, Solemn High Mass, Vespers, Asperges, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and Absolution for the Dead. With numerous illustrations. Fourth edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

The Office of Tenebrae. Transposed from the Gregorian chant into Modern Notation:

Complete Office and Appendix. Cloth, *net*, $1 65

Complete Office without Appendix. Cloth, *net*, $1 00

Appendix, containing harmonizations of the Lamentations separately. Cloth, *net*, 0 75

Meditations, New Practical, for Every Day in the Year, on the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Chiefly intended for the use of religious communities. By the Rev. Father BRUNO VERCRUYSSE, S.J. The only complete English translation. Published with the Approbation and under the direction of the author. Enriched by several Novenas and Octaves; Meditations for the First Friday of every Month and for the days of Communion; Exercises preparatory to the Renewal of Vows, and for a Retreat of eight Days, etc. 2 vols., 1244 pages. Extra cloth, beveled boards, red edges, $4 00

Meditations on the Passion of Our Lord. Together with a Manual of the Black Scapular of the Passion, and Daily Prayers. From the Italian, by a PASSIONIST FATHER. With 14 full-page Illustrations of the Way of the Cross. 32mo, cloth, red edges, 40 cents.

Meditations for Every Day in the Year. Collected from different Spiritual Writers and suited for the Practice called "Quarter of an Hour's Solitude." Edited by Rev. ROGER BAXTER, S.J., of Georgetown College. It is now republished and revised in the 251st year of Jesuit labor in the United States, by Rev. P. NEALE, S.J. Second edition. Small 12mo, cloth, red edges, *net*, $1 25

Meditations on the Sufferings of Jesus Christ. From the Italian of Rev. FRANCIS DA PERINALDO, O.S.F., by a member of the same Order. 12mo, cloth, $1 25

Merrick, Rev. D. A., S.J.

Saints of the Society of Jesus. 16mo, paper, *net*, 10 cents; cloth gilt, *net*, 25 cents.

A Sketch of the Society of Jesus. 16mo, paper, *net*, 10 cents; cloth gilt, *net*, 25 cents.

Miraculous Power of the Memorare, illustrated by Examples. From the French of a Marist Father, by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. Paper, 10 cents; per 100, $6 00
Maroquette, 20 cents; per 100, $12 00

Mistress of Novices, The, instructed in her Duties; or, a Method of Direction for the use of Persons charged with the Training of Souls in Christian Perfection. From the French of the ABBÉ LEGUAY, by Rev. IGNATIUS SISK. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

Monk's Pardon. A Historical Romance of the Time of Philip IV. of Spain. From the French of RAOUL DE NAVERY by ANNA T. SADLIER. 12mo, cloth, $1 25

Month of the Dead; or, Prompt and Easy Deliverance of the Souls in Purgatory. From the French of the ABBE CLOQUET, by a SISTER OF MERCY. Approved by the Sacred Congregation, by His Lordship, the Archbishop of Bourges, and His Grace, the Archbishop of New York. With a steel-plate Frontispiece. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Month of May. From the French of Father DEBUSSI, S.J., by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 4th edition. 24mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Muller, Rev. Michael, C.SS.R.

God the Teacher of Mankind. A plain, comprehensive Explanation of Christian Doctrine. 9 vols., crown 8vo, cloth.

The Church and her Enemies,	*net*, $1 10
The Apostles' Creed,	*net*, 1 10
The First and Greatest Commandment,	*net*, 1 40
Explanation of the Commandments, continued. Precepts of the Church,	*net*, 1 10
Dignity, Authority, and Duties of Parents, Ecclesiastical and Civil Powers. Their Enemies,	*net*, 1 40
Grace and the Sacraments,	*net*, 1 25
Holy Mass,	*net*, 1 25
Eucharist and Penance,	*net*, 1 10
Sacramentals—Prayers, etc.,	*net*, 1 00

Familiar Explanation of Catholic Doctrine for the Family and more Advanced Students in Catholic Colleges, Academies, and High Schools, for Persons of Culture, Old as well as Young. With a popular Refutation of the Principal Modern Errors. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

The Prodigal Son; or, The Sinner's Return to God. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

The Devotion of the Holy Rosary and the Five Scapulars. Crown 8vo, *net*, 75 cents.

No Salvation out of the Church. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

The Catholic Priesthood. 2 vols. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, $3 00

My First Communion: The Happiest Day of My Life. A Preparation and Remembrance for First Communicants. From the German of Rev. J. N. BUCHMANN, O.S.B., by Rev. RICHARD BRENNAN, LL.D. 16mo, cloth, elegant. Illustrated, 75 cents.

Names that Live in Catholic Hearts. Cardinal Ximenes—Michael Angelo—Samuel de Champlain—Archbishop Plunkett—Charles Carroll—Henry Larochejacquelein—Simon de Montfort. By Miss ANNA T. SADLIER. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

Natalie Narischkin, Sister of Charity of St. Vincent of Paul. From the French by Lady G. FULLERTON. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

Novena in Honor of the Holy Face of Our Lord. Adapted from the French by the Sisters of the Divine Compassion. Paper, 10 cents; per 100, $6 00
Maroquette, 20 cents; per 100, 12 00

Novena in Honor of St. Catharine de Ricci, a Religious of the Third Order of St. Dominic. By the Dominican Sisters, Albany, N. Y. 32mo, paper, *net*, 10 cents.

O'Grady, Eleanor.

Aids to Correct and Effective Elocution. With Selected Readings and Recitations for Practice. 12mo, cloth, $1 25

Select Recitations for Catholic Schools and Academies. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

Readings and Recitations for Juniors. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 50 cents.

On Christian Art. By EDITH HEALY. 16mo, cloth, 50 cents.

On the Condition of Labor. Encyclical Letter of Our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII. 8vo, paper, 10 cents; per 100, $6 00

One Angel More in Heaven. With Letters of Condolence and of Consolation by St. Francis de Sales and others. White mar., 50 cents.

Our Birthday Bouquet. Culled from the Shrines of the Saints and the Gardens of the Poets. By ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 16mo, cloth, $1 00

Our Lady of Good Counsel in Genazzano. A History of that Ancient Sanctuary and of the wonderful Apparition and Miraculous Translation in 1467 of Our Lady's Sacred Image from Scutari to Genazzano. By ANNE R. BENNETT, née GLADSTONE, 32mo, cloth, 75 cts.

Our Own Will and How to Detect it in Our Actions. Instructions intended for Religious. Applicable also to all who aim at the Perfect Life. By the Rev. JOHN ALLEN, D.D. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

Paradise on Earth Opened to All; or, A Religious Vocation the Surest Way in Life. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Path which led a Protestant Lawyer to the Catholic Church. By P. H. BURNETT. 8vo, cloth, $2 00

Philosophy, English Manuals of Catholic.

1. **Logic.** By RICHARD F. CLARKE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25
2. **First Principles of Knowledge.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J., Professor of Logic and General Metaphysics at St. Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25
3. **Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law).** By JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25
4. **Natural Theology.** By BERNARD BOEDDER, S.J., Professor of Natural Theology at Stonyhurst. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 50
5. **Psychology.** By MICHAEL MAHER, S.J., Professor of Mental Philosophy at Stonyhurst College. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 50
6. **General Metaphysics.** By JOHN RICKABY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25
7. **A Manual of Political Economy.** By C. S. DEVAS, Esq , M.A., Examiner in Economy in the Royal University of Ireland. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 50

Pictorial Lives of the Saints. With Reflections for Every Day in the Year. Including the Lives of the American Saints recently placed on the Calender for the United States by petition of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and also the Lives of the Saints, canonized in 1881 by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. Edited by JOHN GILMARY SHEA, LL.D. 50th Thousand. 8vo, cloth, $2 00
5 copies, $6.65—10 copies, $12.50—25 copies, $27.50—50 copies, $50.00.

Practice of Humility, The. By His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. From the Italian by Rev. J. F. X. O'CONOR, S.J. 32mo.
With red line. Cloth gilt, 50 cents.
Without red line.
Paper, 10 cents; per 100, $6 00
Maroquette, 20 " " 12 00

Praxis Synodalis. Manuale Synodi Diocesanæ ac Provincialis Celebrandæ. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 60 cents.

Primer for Converts, A. Showing the Reasonable Service of Catholics. By Rev. J. T. DURWARD. 32mo, cloth, flexible, *net*, 25 cents.

Principles of Anthropology and Biology. By Rev. THOMAS HUGHES, S.J. Second edition. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

Reading and the Mind, with Something to Read. By Rev. J. F. X. O'CONOR, S.J. Second edition. Paper, 25 cents.

Religious State, The. Together with a Short Treatise on the Vocation to the Priesthood. From the Italian of St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.SS.R. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Rights of Our Little Ones; or, First Principles on Education in Catechetical Form. By Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J.
32mo, paper, 15 cents; per 100, $9 00
" cloth inked, 25 " " 12 00

Rosary, The Most Holy, in Thirty-one Meditations, Prayers, and Examples, suitable for the Months of May and October. With prayers. By Rev. EUGENE GRIMM, C.SS.R. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.
Marquette, 35 cents.

Russo, N., S.J.—De Philosophia Morali Prælectiones in Collegio Georgiopolitano Soc. Jes. Anno 1889–90 Habitae, a Patre NICOLAO RUSSO. Editio altera. 8vo, half leather, *net*, $2 00

Sacramentals of the Holy Catholic Church, The. By Rev. A. A. LAMBING, LL.D., author of "A History of the Catholic Church in the Dioceses of Pittsburgh and Alleghany," etc. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25

Sacred Heart, Books on the.

Devotions to the Sacred Heart for the First Friday of Every Month. From the French of P. HUGUET, Marist, by a SISTER OF MERCY. Cloth, red edges, with a steel-plate Frontispiece, 40 cents.

213. Imitation Levant, limp, gilt centre, round corners, edges red under gold, $1 35

Familiar Conferences on the Theology of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By Rev. E. M. HENNESSY. 12mo, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

Imitation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By Rev. F. ARNOUDT, S.J. From the Latin by Rev. J. M. FASTRE, S.J. 12mo, cloth, $2 00

Month of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Devotions for Every day of the Month. From the French of Rev. Father HUGUET, by a SISTER OF MERCY. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

One and Thirty Days with Blessed Margaret Mary. From the French by a Visitandine of Baltimore. 32mo, maroquette, 25 cents.

Pearls from the Casket of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. A Collection of the Letters, Maxims, and Practices of the Blessed MARGARET MARY ALACOQUE. Edited by ELEANOR C. DONNELLY. 32mo, cloth, red edges, gilt side. With a steel-plate Frontispiece, 50 cents.

Sacred Heart, Month of the, for the Young Christian. By BROTHER PHILIPPE. From the French by E. A. MULLIGAN. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Sacred Heart of Jesus. Short Meditations for the Month of June. By R. F. CLARKE, S.J. 18mo, mar., gilt side, 15 cents; per 100, $10 00

Sacred Heart Studied in the Sacred Scriptures. By Rev. H. SAINTRAIN. C.SS.R. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 00

Sacred Heart, Revelations of the, to Blessed Margaret Mary; and the History of her Life. From the French of Monseigneur BOUGAUD, by a Visitandine of Baltimore. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, $1 50

Year of the Sacred Heart. A Thought for Every Day of the Year. Drawn from the works of PÈRE DE LA COLOMBIÈRE, of Blessed MARGARET MARY, and of others. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Saints, The New, of 1888: St. John Berchmans, S.J.; St. Peter Claver, S.J; St. Alphonsus Rodriguez, S.J.; and the Seven Sainted Founders of the Servites. By Rev. FRANCIS GOLDIE, S.J., and Rev. Father SCOLA, S.J. 18mo, cloth. With 4 full-page illustrations, 50 cts.

Schouppe, Short Sermons for Low Masses. Comprising a complete, brief course of instruction on Christian Doctrine. By Rev. F. X. SCHOUPPE S.J. Second edition. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25

Secret of Sanctity, The. According to St. FRANCIS DE SALES and Father CRASSET, S.J. From the French, by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

Seraphic Guide. A Manual for the Members of the Third Order of St. Francis. According to the recent decisions of the Holy See. By A FRANCISCAN FATHER. (Cust. S.Joan. Bapt.) Cloth, 60 cents. Roan, red edges, 75 cents.

The same in German at the same prices.

Sermons for the Sundays and Chief Festivals of the Ecclesiastical Year. With Two Courses of Lenten Sermons and a Triduum for the Forty Hours. By Rev. JULIUS POTTGEISSER, S.J. From the German by Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. 2 vols., 12mo, cloth, *net*, $2 50

Sermons Moral and Dogmatic on the Fifteen Mysteries of the Holy Rosary. By Rev. M. J. FRINGS. Translated by J. R. ROBINSON. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 00

Short Stories on Christian Doctrine: A Collection of Examples illustrating the Catechism. From the French by Miss MARY MCMAHON. 12mo, cloth. With six full-page illustrations, $1 00

Simplicity in Prayer. From the French, by a Daughter of St. FRANCIS DE SALES, Baltimore. 32mo, cloth, *net*, 30 cents.

Six Sermons on Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. From the German of Rev. Dr. E. BIERBAUM, by Miss ELLA MCMAHON. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 0 60

Smith, Rev. S. B., D.D.

Elements of Ecclesiastical Law. Compiled with reference to the Syllabus, the "Const. Apostolicæ Sedis" of Pope Pius IX., the Council of the Vatican, and the latest decisions of the Roman Congregations.

Vol. I. **Ecclesiastical Persons.** 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 50
Vol. II. **Ecclesiastical Trials.** 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 50
Vol. III. **Ecclesiastical Punishments.** 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 50

—— **Compendium Juris Canonici,** ad usum Cleri et Seminariorum, hujus regionis accomodatum. Third edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 00

—— **The Marriage Process in the United States.** 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 50

Socialism Exposed and Refuted. By Rev. VICTOR CATHREIN, S.J. A Chapter from the author's Moral Philosophy. From the German. By Rev. JAMES CONWAY, S.J. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

Solid Virtue: A Triduum and Spiritual Conferences. By Rev. FATHER BELLECIUS, S.J. From the Latin, by a FATHER OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS. With the permission of Superiors. 16mo, cloth, 60 cents.

Souvenir of the Novitiate. Especially intended for the use of Religious Communities devoted to the Education of Youth. From the French by Rev. EDWARD I. TAYLOR. 32mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Spiritual Crumbs for Hungry Little Souls. To which are added Stories from the Bible. By MARY E. RICHARDSON. 16mo, cloth, *net*, 40 cents.

Stories for First Communicants, for the Time before and after First Communion. Drawn from the best authorities by Rev. J. A. KELLER, D.D. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents; maroquette, 35 cents.

St. Teresa's Own Words; or, Instructions on the Prayer of Recollection. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Sunday-School Teacher's Manual; or, The Art of teaching Catechism. For the use of Teachers and Parents. By Rev. A. A. LAMBING. 16mo, cloth, 75 cents.

Sure Way to a Happy Marriage. A Book of Instructions for those Betrothed and for Married People. From the German by Rev. EDWARD I. TAYLOR. (25th Thousand.)

Paper,	30 cents; per 100,	$18 00
Maroquette,	40 " "	24 00
Cloth,	60 " "	36 00

Tales and Legends of the Middle Ages. From the Spanish of F. DE P. CAPELLA. By HENRY WILSON. 16mo, fancy binding, $1 00

Think Well On't; or, Reflections on the Great Truths of the Christian Religion, for every Day of the Month. By the Right Rev. R. CHALLONER, D.D. 32mo, cloth, flexible, 20 cents.

Thought from St. Alphonsus, for Every Day of the Year. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Thought from Benedictine Saints. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Thought from Dominican Saints. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Thought from St. Francis Assisi and his Saints. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Thought from St. Ignatius. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Thought from St. Teresa. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

Thought from St. Vincent de Paul. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents.

True Spouse of Christ; or, The Nun Sanctified by the Virtues of her State. By St. ALPHONSUS LIGUORI. Crown 8vo, cloth, $1 50

Truths of Salvation. By Rev. J. PERGMAYR, S.J. From the German by a Father of the same Society. 16mo, cloth, $1 00

Twelve Virtues, The, of a Good Teacher. For Mothers, Instructors, and all charged with the Education of Girls. By Rev. H. POTTIER, S.J. From the French. 32mo, flexible, cloth, red edges, *net*, 30 cents.

Visits to the Most Holy Sacrament and to the Blessed Virgin Mary. For Every Day of the Month. By St. ALPHONSUS DE LIGUORI. Edited by Rev. EUGENE GRIMM. 32mo, cloth, 50 cents; mar., 35 cents.
219 Persian calf, padded, fancy stamping, round corners, edges red under gold $1 35
127 German calf, limp, gilt centre, round corners, edges red under gold..... 1 80

Ward, Rev. Thomas F.

Thirty-two Instructions for the Month of May and for the Feasts of the Blessed Virgin. From the French. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

Fifty-two Instructions on the Principal Truths of Our Holy Religion. From the French. 12mo, cloth, *net*, 75 cents.

Way of Interior Peace. Dedicated to Our Lady of Peace. By Rev. FATHER DE LEHEN, S.J. Translated from the German Version of Rev. JAMES BRUCKER, S.J., by a Religious. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25

Weninger's Sermons.

1. **Original Short and Practical Sermons for Every Sunday of the Year.** Three Sermons for Every Sunday. 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 00
2. **Sermons for Every Feast of the Ecclesiastical Year.** Three Sermons for Every Feast. 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 00
3. **Conferences specially addressed to Married and Unmarried Men.** 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 00
4. **Conferences for Married and Unmarried Women.** 8vo, cloth, *net*, $2 00
5. **Original Short and Practical Sermons in honor of the Blessed Sacrament.** Thirty-six Sermons, in twelve divisions, three in each. 8vo, cloth, *net*, $1 75

What Catholics have done for Science, with Sketches of the great Catholic Scientists. By Rev. MARTIN S. BRENNAN. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

Will of God, The. From the French, by M. A. M. To which is added an easy Method of Attending Holy Mass with Profit, by St. LEONARD of Port-Maurice.
Paper, 10 cents; per 100, $6 00
Maroquette, 20 " " 12 00

Women of Catholicity: Margaret O'Carroll—Isabella of Castile—Margaret Roper—Marie de l'Incarnation—Margaret Bourgeoys—Ethan Allen's Daughter. By Miss ANNA T. SADLIER. 12mo, cloth, $1 00

Words of Jesus Christ during His Passion, explained in their Literal and Moral Sense. Translated from the French of Rev. F. X. SCHOUPPE, S.J., by Rev. J. J. QUINN. Maroquette, silver side, 25 cents.

Words of Wisdom. A Concordance of the Sapiential Books. From the French. 12mo, cloth, *net*, $1 25

Zeal in the Work of the Ministry; or, The Means by which every Priest may render his ministry Honorable and Fruitful. From the French of L'ABBÉ DUBOIS. Crown 8vo, cloth, *net*, $1 50

Date Due


283
12206
Marshall, A.F.
Comedy of English
Protestantism